

JS  
3625  
T48s





THE LIBRARY  
OF  
THE UNIVERSITY  
OF CALIFORNIA  
LOS ANGELES





# THE STORY OF THE LONDON COUNTY COUNCIL

A SERIES OF ARTICLES  
BY  
**The Times**  
SPECIAL CORRESPONDENT.



LONDON:  
PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY GEORGE EDWARD WRIGHT, AT  
THE TIMES OFFICE, PRINTING-HOUSE-SQUARE, LONDON, E.C.

1907.

NATIONAL UNIONIST PARTY  
REFERENCE  
27 OCT 1926

ALL INFORMATION CONTAINED  
HEREIN IS UNCLASSIFIED  
DATE 10/1/01 BY 1043

# The Story of the London County Council.

*January 21, 1907.*

## I.

The London County Council has just completed 18 years of existence. It came into the world on January 17, 1889, when the first elections took place. Along with the other county councils it was brought into being by the Local Government Act, of 1888, which was the work of a Conservative Government, and more particularly of the late Lord Ritchie, who as Mr. Ritchie was in charge of the measure. When emphasis is laid upon the democratic mission of the London County Council and on its achievements for the benefit of London its origin should not be forgotten. The orators of the Progressive party, who at every possible opportunity dilate with so much eloquence and satisfaction upon their own record, might remember to whom they owe their municipal existence ; but somehow they never do, unless it be to complain of the inadequate powers entrusted to them. Upon that head there will be something to say presently ; but meantime, if these things are to be thrown, as Progressives insist, into the scales of party politics, they may be reminded that Radical Governments have been in power since the London County Council was created by Conservatives, yet the only large extension of power it has received was bestowed by the same party, which has been heartily abused for its pains.

The Act of 1888 was received with no popular enthusiasm. It is an exceedingly long and complicated measure, which no one, except Mr. Ritchie himself, took the trouble to master at the time. Lord Rosebery, when he stood for election under it, frankly confessed that he had not ; and it is more than probable that to this day nobody has ever mastered it. Nevertheless it has been on the whole decidedly and even markedly successful. The county councils have added to the dignity and the efficiency

LIBRARY SETS

DEC 16 1940

HARDING

of that system of local government which is one of the most salient features of our political organization. As a rule, they do their work well and in a businesslike way, they enjoy the respect and confidence of the ratepayers in a far higher degree than the smaller units of local administration. But by the irony of history the London Council, which aroused more hopes and attracted more attention than any other, has proved an exception and has failed to satisfy public expectation. Public dissatisfaction with the Metropolitan Board of Works had grown so acute that the substitution of a more representative, important, and responsible body was felt to be inevitable. As a matter of fact, the Board of Works had done a great deal of good and lasting work during its 33 years of existence, and it left behind it some standing monuments of its activity which its successor has not yet equalled or even approached. It constructed the main drainage and the Thames Embankment, which is the finest thing that modern London has to show ; it effected vast improvements by the clearing of insanitary areas and the laying-out of new streets ; it freed the bridges from tolls, provided some thousands of acres of parks and open spaces, established the Fire Brigade, and maintained it in a state of efficiency which made it a model for other countries. That is not a bad record of positive achievement, and nothing was suggested against the integrity of the members as a whole. As *The Times* said, " They are honourable men, whose hands are absolutely pure in the sense of any direct or legal liability, but a very large number are not innocent of the negligence which tempts to official knavery." They were, no doubt, too small a body for the adequate discharge of their multifarious functions, their administration became weak, and with a slack control abuses crept in. It is wholesome to recall all this, because a similar situation is confronting their successors, who are more numerous, but whose duties have increased in a still greater ratio and are being relegated more and more to the real control of officials. And the members of the County Council are, as will be presently shown by the mouth of an unimpeachable witness, of very much the same character as those of the older body. The one difference is that they are directly responsible to the ratepayers ; and what that is worth we shall see when they come up for judgment in the course of a few weeks.

There was, then, a real demand for a new authority in London, and much was hoped from it. No body ever came into existence with more general good will or fairer prospects. But from the first, and even before the first, expectation was disappointed. The hope generally entertained by all who were interested in the government of London was that advantage might be taken of the opportunity to obtain a body of men whose position, ability, and reputation would command popular confidence and respect. Newspapers of all shades of opinion expressed themselves in that sense and deprecated the introduction of party politics as alien



to the occasion. But when the candidates came forward it was perceived that, with the exception of Lord Rosebery and Sir John Lubbock, who stood for the City, and perhaps two or three others, they by no means answered to the character required. The Radical journals, in particular, were acutely disappointed and did not hesitate to say so in very blunt terms. The *Daily Chronicle* in an article published on January 7, 1889, said that the list of candidates was disappointing : —

Of the great bulk of the nominees we must frankly say they are most of them but slightly superior, while many of them are actually inferior, to the old-fashioned type of candidate who was sent up by the vestries to the moribund Board of Works . . . they will be found as a body less competent for the practical work of efficient and thrifty local administration than the justices of the peace. If the London County Council is to be composed of persons of this type it is very unlikely that in our time there will arise a popular demand for an extension of its powers or an elevation of its *status*. . . . It is perfectly certain that the Council need not expect to be entrusted with authority over us comparable with that which the municipal councils of Glasgow, Liverpool, Manchester, and Birmingham wield over their constituents.

The *Daily News* regretted that "more men of tried capacity and public distinction had not come forward" and thought that "it was hardly worth while to get rid of the Board of Works if mere vestrymen were to continue." The same authority said two days later "the list of candidates includes very few men of national reputation." It is worth while to reproduce these expressions of opinion because they explain the apathy of the electors and the failure of the Council to command the prestige which it was hoped would signalize the constitution of the new authority and strengthen its hands. Public confidence was further discouraged by the total failure of a great many candidates to grasp the nature of the functions which they were eager to undertake. As the *Daily Chronicle* said, what was wanted was to get "the best possible administration of local affairs," and to that end the electors "should endeavour to get the County Council composed of the best men of business whose services were attainable." But the candidates apparently thought the Council was to be a legislative body, and showed much less concern about administering the powers entrusted to them by Parliament than about obtaining other vast powers which had been withheld. Their election addresses teemed with large promises and ambitious programmes, which included such trifling matters as control of the police, the liquor traffic, the City companies and the metropolitan charities, absorption of the City Corporation, the acquisition of the water supply, gas, and the markets ;

the taxation of ground-rents, equalization of rates and alteration of the incidence of rating from occupier to owner ; Sunday closing, local option, and other things with which the Council had nothing whatever to do. In short, it was a grand display of fireworks by pure faddists and unpractical schemers. In vain Lord Rosebery, who delivered a number of extremely sensible speeches, rebuked all this foolish and ignorant nonsense. He said that politics were not the business of the County Council at all :—

It is no part of the duty of the London County Council to discuss what powers ought to be heaped on it ; it will be mainly occupied in organization. The hands of the County Council will be too full for the next three years to undertake any more business than it has already, in fact I doubt rather whether it will be able to adequately discharge all the duties that will devolve upon it, and the question of the enlargement of its powers will rest not with the County Council but with the Imperial Parliament.

He pleaded for a practical view of the Council's functions, while *The Times* and other newspapers pointed out that the way for the Council to obtain sundry powers and prerogatives withheld was to prove to Parliament its right to fuller confidence by the excellent accomplishment of its actual work. But this good advice fell on deaf ears, and the consequence is that the Council has never obtained them, although those who most desired them have had a free hand in its affairs. Public dissatisfaction with the candidates and their misconception of the duties entrusted to them was further increased by the manœuvring at the first election. In all the brazen annals of political electioneering there are few more cynical pages than this. The election was supposed to be non-political, and the introduction of party politics was strongly deprecated by public men of the greatest influence, including Mr. Gladstone and Lord Rosebery ; and the same line was taken by the newspapers. Lord Rosebery declared in his election address to the City constituency that "absolute freedom from party politics was the only basis which he could accept," and he admitted that if the election were to be on party lines he would have no chance of election. Sir John Lubbock, his fellow-candidate for the same constituency, wrote to the *Daily Chronicle* protesting against being described as standing as a Liberal Unionist, and expressing "a strong feeling that the selection of representatives on the County Council ought not to be determined by party considerations." This plea was endorsed by a leading article, which expressed the view that "the duties which a county council has to perform are by no means political." The result of all this was that political considerations were largely

disregarded by the electors, who returned Sir John Lubbock and Lord Rosebery at the head of the poll, together with 69 other members professing Liberal or Radical politics against 47 Conservatives. There would have been nothing to regret in this—indeed the return of Sir John Lubbock and Lord Rosebery was a very fortunate thing for the Council—if the disregard of party politics had been maintained; but the temptation was too great. The Radical newspapers hailed the result as a great victory for the party, and Mr. John Morley in a speech at Sheffield claimed the elections as proof of London sympathy with Radical party politics.

Thenceforward the Council was committed to party procedure, which has had a very bad effect upon its conduct. The majority, which consisted chiefly of those who had made the most lavish promises to their constituents, were confirmed by success at the polls in their intentions, and in order to be in a position to give effect to them they promptly proceeded to treat the minority in a spirit of the narrowest partisanship. The first duty of the new body was to elect 19 aldermen, and here again a trick was played. The majority, who had already formed themselves into a compact body, made some feint of inviting the rest to confer with them and of considering a list of aldermen to be proposed by the minority. The latter accordingly drew up a list, not on party lines, but containing the names of three gentlemen agreeable to the majority; but when the matter came to voting, the majority simply elected their own list and ignored the nominees of the minority with one exception. A few Liberal members voted for Lord Meath in preference to some obscure candidate on their own list, and he was elected. The political character of their proceeding was placed beyond doubt by the fact that it followed the advice of the party organs which urged that the election of aldermen should be carried out on party lines. The full Council, thus constituted, then proceeded to complete its organization in the same spirit by electing the Chairman, vice-chairman, and deputy chairman all from the same party. Lord Rosebery was doubtless elected Chairman instead of Sir John Lubbock—who had headed the poll, acted as provisional chairman, and enjoyed equal confidence—simply because Lord Rosebery was then a Home Ruler and supposed to be a more “advanced” politician than Sir John, who was a Liberal Unionist.

But why rake up all this ancient history? Because the past gives the key to the present; the position of the Council can only be understood in the light of its history. As it began so it has continued. It has never enjoyed the prestige or secured the general confidence which are necessary to make it the efficient, dignified, and representative body that it ought to be. In fact it has lost ground. Its failure is reflected in the elections. On the first occasion, 18 years ago, the electors in general displayed,

for the reasons given, much less interest than had been expected. Sir John Lubbock and Lord Rosebery, who were the most distinguished candidates and openly standing for good administration dissociated from politics, received more than 8,000 votes apiece ; but no other successful candidate approached that number. Few exceeded 3,000, and many had less than 2,000 votes cast for them. " Little excitement was shown in any part of London," says the cold chronicle of the Annual Register, " and in few cases did more than one-half of the electors go to the poll." In 1895 a rally was made. Dissatisfaction with the party in power, which had in the first Council been checked in its exuberant aspirations and kept to business by the influence of Lord Rosebery, Sir John Lubbock, Lord Lingen, and other men of experience, became acute, and a serious contest took place, in which 540,000 votes were cast and the Moderate party secured a majority of 30,000, but only an equal number of seats with the other side ; and this equality was nullified by the preponderant votes of Progressive aldermen. In the last two elections only 40 and 45 per cent. of the voters went to the poll. In the last of all the highest proportion in any constituency was 64 per cent. ; in six constituencies less than one-third of the electors took the trouble to vote, and in many others the number was not much greater. The thing had become a farce.

And all this time the same party has been in power. It gradually acquired the name " Progressive," how, nobody knows. These names come by some indefinable process and gradually attach themselves. Some candidates at the first election called themselves Progressive Reformers ; probably they took the term from the Radical " Progress " party in Germany. For some time they were called indifferently Progressists and Progressives, until the latter word won general acceptance. But they certainly identified themselves, as has been shown, with the Radical party in politics. The term " Moderate," applied to the other Municipal party, arose in a similar manner. It is to be observed that candidates of both parties appealed to the electors in 1889 as municipal reformers ; but some were progressive or theoretical, others moderate or practical, reformers. So the names arose. As municipal politics stand at present, the honoured chiefs of the first County Council, to whom it owed whatever prestige it had, would certainly be moderate reformers, whereas the Progressives have become more and more closely identified with Socialism, wherein they have merely anticipated, by very little, the course of their party in Parliament. But, in any case, the one party has been in power from the first. For a few years following 1895 it had the salutary experience of an opposition as powerful as itself, and the influence of this period is seen in the Council's records ; but for the rest it has held undisputed sway, which has grown less and less balanced of late years. Now this is not good for any party. The theory of

party government presupposes a strong Opposition and an occasional change of power. That was drummed into our ears often enough in the last Parliament. Too long a lease of power demoralizes its holders, blunts their sense of responsibility, narrows their views, and intoxicates them with self-esteem. It is more important, no doubt, for a legislative than for an administrative body, which has, indeed, no business with parties at all ; for party means a policy based on theory, whereas the only policy of an administrative body should be the efficient discharge of the duties assigned to it. But the Progressives on the London County Council have never taken that view of their functions. They chose to constitute themselves a party with a policy based on theory, in the teeth of the protestations and advice of the ablest men among them, and they have always been more concerned in pushing their policy than in discharging their plain duties. The nature of that policy and its results will be examined in subsequent articles ; here it is enough to say that they have been in power too long for their own health and the public good.



*January 29, 1907.*

## II.

The duties assigned to the London County Council by Parliament are numerous, varied, and important ; they have never satisfied its ambition, which is boundless ; but they have fully engaged its capacity, which is limited. They are less extensive than the duties successfully discharged by other municipal authorities both in this and in other countries ; but that is counterbalanced by the great size of the area administered (121 square miles) and its vast population ( $4\frac{1}{2}$  millions), which render many of the functions of local government proportionately more onerous than in smaller and less populous places. That must not be forgotten when its work comes to be examined ; but at the same time it is necessary to insist upon the fact that some of the most important public duties are in London discharged by other bodies, and to distinguish their spheres of action. This is necessary because the less modest County Councillors have contracted an unfortunate habit of magnifying their own achievements in a boastful manner, of which Mr. John Burns, ever a great performer on the big drum, has just given us a characteristic example. They were wont to declare very loudly that London is the best governed, the healthiest, and generally the most deserving-of-superlatives city in the world, and to take all the credit for this enviable condition to themselves. They give none to the other public bodies which share the administration, none to philanthropy or private enterprise. This practice has grown so common that it is taken as a matter of course, but it is really very remarkable and quite peculiar to the Progressive London County Councillor. The spokesmen of other administrative bodies may defend their administration when attacked, and on laying down their office or appealing to the electorate they may give a favourable account of their stewardship ; but in doing so they exercise some restraint and assume some appearance of modesty. Such expressions as " we may have made mistakes," " we have done our best," " we regret this or that state of things " are usual ; they do not claim perfection or a monopoly of virtue and they do not assume the credit for things done by some one else. London County Councillors do. They seem to live in a stupor of admiration at their own greatness, wisdom, and benevolence. This is the picture drawn for us in a recent annual review of the Council's work by the then Chairman :—

I find that the Council is becoming more and more the guardian may I say the guardian angel ? of the citizen. Indeed it now follows him and guards him from the cradle to the grave. It looks after his health, personal safety, and

afflicted relatives ; it protects him from all sorts of public nuisances ; it endeavours to see that he is decently housed, or itself houses him ; it keeps an eye on his coal cellar and larder ; it endeavours to make his city more beautiful and convenient, and provides electric motors and (presently) steam yachts for his convenience and pleasure ; it looks after his municipal purse and corporate property, and treasures his historical memories ; it tends and enriches his broad acres and small open spaces and cheers him with music ; it sees that those he employs, directly or indirectly, enjoy tolerable wages and fair conditions ; it speaks up for him in Parliament, both as to what he wants and what he does not want, and, last and greatest of all, it now looks after his children, good and bad, hoping, if it is possible, to make them better and wiser than their progenitors.

This poetical outburst offers in every line an easy target for the shafts of satire ; but satire is not the object of these articles ; and the citizen, who is followed and guarded from the cradle to the grave, whether he likes it or not, will readily supply his own comments.

The immediate point is the sober fact that the most important of the services just enumerated, except education, are really rendered by other bodies in a far larger degree than by the County Council. Safety, for example, is mainly the affair of the police ; health falls to the borough councils, which are chiefly responsible for sanitation, to the Metropolitan Asylums Board, which with the borough councils deals with infectious disease, and to the Water Board, which looks after the most important of all health factors. There are also the hospitals, a somewhat important element, and the City Corporation, which is the Port Sanitary Authority, and with neither of these has the County Council anything whatever to do. Do they count for nothing ? Do they render no public services ? Then it may be pointed out that private enterprise, philanthropic and commercial, has done a great deal more for housing, for beautification, and convenience than the County Council, and that the citizen has his own direct representatives in Parliament, who are sent there to speak up for him and have generally been chosen to oppose the influence of the County Council. The very fact that the other agencies mentioned and many more do exist and share in carrying on the public business of London is a constant grievance to Progressive County Councillors, who want to have everything in their own hands ; but recognition is confined to the shortcomings of these objectionable bodies ; their merits are claimed by the County Council. In short, everything good in London, including the " historical memories," is somehow put down to its credit ; and everything bad to some one else's account.

What is the reason for this insistent self-glorification ? It

renders the Council ridiculous and must be very offensive to many members. The only explanation is the political programme and party administration of the Progressive majority. The whole business reeks of the platform. The brag is not personal, but political and intended for the electors, who have to be persuaded that the Progressive party can do nothing wrong and nobody else can do anything right. In private life the braggarts are doubtless as modest as other men, but as members of the party they must throw modesty to the winds and blow the trumpet until our ears crack. Only a day or two ago the gentleman who was until recently chairman of the Highways Committee of the Council referred in the public Press to the South London tramways, which it has built and managed, as "the most comfortable, durable, up-to-date, and best managed system of electric tramways of any city in the world." These shrill superlatives, applied to a fairly good but not at all exceptional service, would not make a favourable impression even if they came from a less interested source; but when a modest man is impelled by party feeling to extol his own work in such extravagant terms the result is to inspire distrust of his other statements and of all those which issue from the same influence. The party is evidently hard pushed to reconcile performance with promises and pretensions, and no account of its doings put forward by its own members can be safely accepted without careful scrutiny.

#### DUTIES AND POWERS OF THE COUNCIL.

The annual report prepared by the Clerk to the Council contains an exhaustive list of its powers and duties arranged under four headings:—

##### COUNTY SERVICES.

Ancient Monuments	Guardians of the Poor
Charities	Highways
Coroners	Licensing Appeals
County Boundary and County Representation	Loan Societies
County Council Elections	Local Medical and Sanitary Officers
County Councils Association	Lunatic Asylums
Expenses	Main Roads
County Medical Officers of Health	Midwives, Supervision of Motor Cars
County Property	Parish Boundaries
County Rate	Pauper Lunatic Grant
County Records	Places of Religious Worship
Criminal Prosecutions	Poor Law Medical Expenses
Drowned Bodies	Public Vaccinators
Emigration	Quarter Sessions of County of London
Fertilizers and Feeding Stuffs	



*County Services (continued).*

Registrars of Births and Deaths Grant	Small Holdings
Royal Patriotic Fund Corporation	Standing Joint Committee
School Fees for Pauper Children Grant	Transfer of Powers
Scientific and Literary Societies	Teachers in Poor Law Schools Grant
	Valuations for Estate Duty
	Wild Birds Protection

## COUNTY AND MUNICIPAL SERVICES.

Barbed Wire	Military Bands
Bridges	Parliamentary Bills
By-Laws for Good Rule and Government	Parliamentary Elections
Destructive Insects	Petroleum
Diseases of Animals	Polling Districts
Education	Prevention of Cruelty to Children
Education, Technical	Racecourses
Employment of Children	Registration of Electors
Explosives	Rivers Pollution Prevention
Fish Conservancy	Seats for Shop Assistants
Gas Meter Testing	Shop Hours
Inebriate Reformatories	Small Dwellings Acquisition
Light Railways	Theatres and Music Halls
Local Stamps	Traffic Regulation
Locomotives on Roads	Weights and Measures

## MUNICIPAL SERVICES.

Bands	Gas Testing
Buildings, Regulation of	Horncuman Museum
Common Lodging Houses	Housing of the Working Classes
Coroners' Courts	Infectious Diseases
Dairies, Cowsheds, and Milkshops	Main Drainage
Dangerous and Neglected Structures	Mortuaries
Dangerous and Noxious Businesses	Nuisances
Disused Burial Grounds	Offensive Trades
Drains, Water Closets, and Cesspools	Parks and Open Spaces
Electric Lighting	Post-mortem rooms
Embankments	Seamen's Lodging Houses
Epidemic Diseases	Smoke Consumption
Factories and Workshops	Street Improvements
Ferries	Streets, Formation of
Fire Brigade	Streets, Naming of, and Numbering of Houses
Floods, Prevention of	Subways
	Thames Steamboats
	Tramways
	Tunnels

## SPECIAL LONDON SERVICES.

Acting in default	London Statistics
Appeals	Markets
Canals Protection	Metropolitan Borough Comm- cillors
Central Criminal Court	National Telephone Com- pany's Works
District Surveyors	Overhead Wires
Dock Companies' Works	Railway Bridges
Dwelling-houses on Low- lying Land	Railway Companies' Works
Equalization of Rates Fund	Sky Signs
Historical Buildings, Monu- ments and Works of Art	Special Inquiries
Hydraulic Power Company's Works	Street Obstructions
Ice Creams or any similar Commodity	Streets in more than one Metropolitan Borough
Indoor Paupers	Superannuation and Provi- dent Fund
Infant Life Protection	Thames Conservancy
Lee Conservancy	Timber Stacks
Lee Valley Drainage Com- mission	Transfer of Powers
Loans, Advance of	Tribunal of Appeal
Loans, Sanction to	University of London
Local Sewers	Valuation Lists
London Government Act, 1899	Water Board, Metropolitan
	Water Supply

This formidable catalogue may suggest that the passion for magnifying the services of the Council extends to its permanent officers and invades its dry official returns : but let us rather ascribe it to thoroughness. Every item is supported by chapter and verse and explained in a very concise and convenient manner. A large number refer to formal, permissive, and supervisory powers of little practical moment, others to the duty of nominating delegates to other administrative bodies ; but quite a sufficient number of active, heavy, and serious duties remain to occupy the full time and energy of the 137 gentlemen who compose the Council. The most important of these duties, with the exception of education, were inherited from the Board of Works ; they comprise main drainage, fire prevention, parks and open spaces, Thames bridges and tunnels, street improvements, building supervision, artisans' dwellings, tramways, and London municipal finance. With regard to most of these the powers and duties transferred from the Board of Works in 1889 have since been enlarged by numerous subsequent Acts, notably the Housing of the Working Classes Acts, the London Building Act of 1894, the Public Health (London) Act of 1891, and the London Government Act of 1899. Then there are some miscellaneous items which were transferred at the formation of the Council from the justices of the peace ; the most important is the case of pauper

linatics, but this is shared by the Metropolitan Asylums Board. An analogous duty is the provision of reformatory and industrial schools. Another, which has excited more public interest, is the granting of music and dancing licences. A different group comprises certain supervisory powers with regard to factories and workshops, shops and common lodging houses. Powers more recently conferred relate to regulations restricting the employment of children, and to the provision of Thames steamboats. Some particular duties concerning the milk supply, nuisances, offensive trades, and other matters connected with public health ought also to be mentioned.

For the purpose of performing these multifarious functions the members of the Council are distributed in about a score of standing committees, with occasional special committees and sub-committees. Already during the life-time of the first Council the constitution of the committees came in for severe criticism on the ground of the political manœuvring of the dominant party. At the outset the first selection of committees was very haphazard, as the Chairman (Lord Rosebery) said in his review of the first year. It was bound to be so in a new body, of which both the work to be done and the inclinations of the members were unknown quantities. It was a process of settling down which gave no opportunity for party organization; and it so happened that in the majority of the committees the gentlemen chosen to be chairmen on the spur of the moment were not members of the dominant party. They were elected because they appeared to the rest to be the fittest men. But when the committees were dissolved and reconstituted in 1890 the Progressive majority altered all that, and arranged the committees so that they should be under the control of the party. The usual plan is for members to signify on what committees they would like to serve; and, of course, some committees are more popular than others, so that there must be some adjustment. The previous arrangement had turned out quite satisfactory according to the Chairman, who said that "by a natural process of adjustment and selection he thought the committees had settled down in having the men most able to attend them, the men most interested in them, so that at last they had got the round pegs in the round holes." And with regard to the chairmen of committees he thought the Council was "singularly to be congratulated on the results it had arrived at." He was speaking, of course, in a complimentary vein, but he could hardly have said this much if the arrangement had been really bad. It did not suit party tactics, however, and it was changed. Conservative members were not allowed to sit on committees on which they had expressed a desire to serve, and Radical members were placed on more committees than they could attend. Mr. Brudenell Carter, who was one of the original members of the Council, drew public attention to these things, and criticized the committee system at length. A controversy

followed in which the working of the committees was warmly defended by several Councillors, not all of one party ; but the charge of packing the committees for party purposes was not answered. The same practice evidently still continues. Out of 41 chairmen and vice-chairmen of committees, 38 are Progressives and the manning of committees gives them an overwhelming majority on each. They have an aggregate majority in the committees of more than three to one, which rises in some cases to four and five to one. The notorious Works Committee is composed solely of Progressives, so that in regard to the working of this peculiarly important and contentious branch of municipal activity 14 whole constituencies, including the City, are practically disfranchised.

The meaning of this extraordinarily complete, exclusive, and dogged party grip of the business of the Council will be discussed in the next article, and its effects on administration in subsequent ones.



**January 31, 1907.**

### III.

It has been shown in the previous articles that the Council, called upon to conduct practical affairs which had, and—in the declared opinion of Radical newspapers and eminent Radical statesmen, in and out of the Council—ought to have, nothing to do with party politics, has nevertheless persistently conducted them on party lines ; that in order to do so it has manipulated its administrative machinery in defiance of the principles of democratic representation ; and that in order to commend the results to the electors the party spokesmen have adopted a practice of extravagant self-laudation, which other men do not permit themselves, associated with detraction of other bodies discharging similar functions and composed of similar elements, including many County Councillors. The explanation of all this is that the party started with a programme or policy which has nothing to do with actual administration. It was a political programme, and administrative office was regarded merely as a lever for carrying it out. That is clear from the election addresses of candidates for the first Council, to which reference has already been made. They called themselves Radicals or Liberals, and were claimed as such by the party organs ; but the measures they advocated and put forward as their programme were inspired wholly by Socialist teaching. Very likely many of them did not know it, and some may not know it now ; apparently they resent being identified with the Socialists. But the word “ socialist ” is not an official title ; it is a descriptive epithet, which covers a great many shades of opinion. It came into use about 75 years ago in connexion with the communistic schemes of Robert Owen, and first appeared in print in the *Poor Man's Guardian*, an Owenite paper, in 1833. It had no precise significance, and it has had none since ; but the philosophical basis of every variety of Socialistic doctrine has always been the same—pure materialism. The ultimate aim is to raise mankind by material means, and the means contemplated by most forms of Socialism are economic. This aspect predominates so much that Socialism has for all practical purposes become a purely economic theory. The methods of fulfilment advocated vary widely. There are very strong differences of opinion between different organizations of professed Socialists, which are no more united than any other sects, and even between individual members of the same organization. (*Naturam expellas fureâ, tamen usque recurret* is a profound and primitive truth which Socialism daily denies and daily illustrates.) But they all rely in some degree upon the substitution of collective for individual

ownership of property and upon what they call the abolition of capital, with a view to making the material conditions of life more equal among the different sections of the community.

That was the idea which inspired the policy of the Progressive party from the first, and inspires it still, whether the members know it or not. The aim is to exalt the humble and put down the proud in a material sense, or, in other words, to rectify the inequalities of circumstance which we see about us. Socialists are often accused of desiring mainly to pull down, and no doubt most of them think that their objects cannot be attained without pulling down ; but that is the means, not the end, though it tends to become the end. The whole history of the movement shows that it originates in an emotional sensibility which is excited by the spectacle of bodily suffering and that its primary purpose is to raise the poor and ameliorate their lot. To deny their sincerity in this is a mistake. On the other hand, it is an equal mistake for Socialists or Progressives to claim a monopoly of merit and deny to others the credit for equally good intentions merely because they differ in opinion about the means of giving effect to them. This self-righteous frame of mind has a sinister influence, because the consciousness of superior virtue, which the London Progressives exhibit in such a marked degree, leads men to the crooked path of justifying conduct by motives and promoting ends which they believe to be good by means which they know to be bad. The order of Jesuits is not the only body versed in casuistry.

The means embodied in the Progressive programme are those which the occasion would at once suggest to any one at all conversant with Socialistic dogmas. The Council was a municipal body, newly constructed, and the opportunities it offered for realizing collective ownership were municipal. That was the burden of the original programme, and has been the burden ever since. The Council was to absorb everything it could in a peaceful way—water, gas, markets, charities, docks, the liquor trade, &c.—and in order to pay for them it was to command the revenues of the City Corporation and the Livery Companies, and to readjust taxation. The control of the police is a corollary of collective ownership, but it was advocated mainly because they had been employed under the Government to prevent public meetings which were thought likely to cause disorder, and this was resented by Socialists. All these proposals, and some others, put forward rather promiscuously at the time of the first election, became extended and consolidated into a formal party programme before the second election in 1892. It was adopted by the Council of the Metropolitan Radical Federation in December, 1891, and it contained the following main provisions, briefly stated :—

1. Trade union rate of wages and scale of hours for all Council contracts.

2. Eight-hours day, and not less than trade union wages for all *employés* of the Council.

3. Direct employment of labour wherever possible.

4. (a) The exercise of existing powers to take over the tramways; (b) additional powers to be obtained to work them.

5. The *maximum* eight-hours day to be a condition precedent in all undertakings getting new Parliamentary powers in London.

6. To obtain powers to take over the plant, &c., of gas companies at valuation.

7. To take over the water supply.

8. Control and management of the police, control of Trafalgar-square, Royal parks, and other open spaces of London.

9. Municipalization of Covent-garden, Spitalfields, and other markets now in private hands without compensation for alleged monopoly rights.

10. Revision of local taxation, including division of rates between owner and occupier; special taxation of land values; rating of empty houses and vacant land; special assessment of "betterment" on property improved at the public cost; absorption of unearned increment by a municipal death duty on real estate.

11. The building and maintenance by the Council itself of artisan dwellings and common lodging-houses.

12. Stop all sales of land already or at any future time belonging to the Council.

13. Pay close attention to the efficient administration of the sanitary laws (by the vestries) and the Factory Acts (by the Home Office), with a view to making proper representations in cases of default or neglect.

14. To promote the establishment of democratic district councils to absorb the existing vestries and district boards.

15. Complete inclusion of the City Corporation within the sphere of the County Council, and reclamation of "London's neglected heritage" in the property of the Livery Companies.

16. Municipalization of the docks by the formation of a representative dock trust.

17. Promote a petition against leasehold enfranchisement.

18. All hospitals, asylums, and dispensaries to be under municipal control and, beyond present endowments, supported by the rates.

To these sufficiently extensive proposals there were subsequently appended several others of a still more visionary and

revolutionary character. If realized, they would render the London County Council a sort of sovereign power practically independent of Parliament and the Crown. Some went even further than this, and were designed to correct the physical and physiological mistakes of Nature at the decree of the Council. The whole thing, with the exception of the trade union clauses, was of purely Socialistic origin. The comparatively feasible suggestions quoted above emanated from the Fabian Society and were embodied in a little book called "The London Programme," by Mr. Sidney Webb, who seems to provide the Progressive party with all its ideas and arguments. The Fabian Society, of which he is a member, represents the most moderate section of professed Socialists and is the sponsor, if not the father, of Municipal Socialism as a policy. It is to be congratulated on its success, which constitutes the only positive results that organized Socialism has yet achieved anywhere; it may be called a success of moderation. The same programme, with some extensions and modifications, has now been adopted by the Independent Labour party, a Socialistic organization of more advanced views than the Fabian Society, and has been put forward as a manifesto in view of the coming election. The items are as follows, in a condensed form:—

1. Enlargement of the Council, in order to increase the Socialist and Labour representation.

2. Unification of municipal functions by absorption of the Metropolitan Asylums Board, Water Board, Thames Conservancy, and "those of the borough councils which have been found by experience to rightly belong to a central rather than a local body."

[This probably means those which elected Municipal Reform candidates at the last election. The previous programme advocated the formation of district councils, but now that they are formed those which do not vote to order are to be abolished.]

As sole authority the County Council to have control of the rates and to be the valuation authority, with equalization of rates, taxation of land values, unoccupied property, &c.

3. Inclusion under the Council of contiguous suburbs all round London.

4. The Council to take over the docks, to supply electricity, not only to London, but to a large area outside, and to own all the means of public locomotion and conveyance of goods, including railways, tubes, trams, and omnibuses.

5. The Council to supervise, finance, and eventually take over the hospitals, &c.

6. The Council to acquire dairy farms and sell milk.

7. The Council to acquire coal mines and retail coal at cost price.



8. The Council "to organize a system of central and local markets and slaughterhouses in conjunction with the borough councils" (? the ones left).

9. The Council to control the police. "The duty of keeping order is a civic one and should be in the hands of the direct representatives of the citizens. The police required for national purposes would, of course, remain under the present system."

10. With regard to housing "the extravagant method of pulling down slums at the expense of the community must be finally abandoned and the cost of such work thrown upon the owners of insanitary property." The Council to buy and control areas contiguous to London and build garden suburbs.

11. Direct employment to be improved by a 48 hours week and a *minimum* wage of 30s. a week : Works Department to be extended.

12. Council to supply meals and medical care to school children ; and free technical, secondary, and University education to every child able to profit by them. "Steps must be taken to break down the artificial division between elementary and other forms of education." Systematic instruction in the rights and duties of citizenship to be given in all schools.

13. Council to be enlarged to 200, and women to be eligible.

This programme is the lineal successor of the previous ones ; it is cast in the same mould, and contains the same items. If it goes a little further in some directions, it is less advanced in others. It does not propose to confiscate the revenues of the City Companies or take over the charities or the Royal parks, nor does it offer to supervise the Home Office. The extensions it proposes are quite logical ; but there is one remarkable omission, which deserves particular attention. No mention is made of the gas supply ; it is quietly dropped out of the programme. Why ? Simply because the workmen employed by the South Metropolitan Gas Company are shareholders in the concern, and the proposal to deprive them of their property would be resented. Only those things which belong to somebody else are to be municipalized for the benefit of "Labour." This is not honest conviction, but a policy of expediency guided by self-interest. And a similar revelation has been produced among Progressives by this same programme. Municipal trading in coal and milk does not meet with their approval ; it seems that some of them have private interests in those commodities. They do not endorse the manifesto of the Independent Labour party, and they insist on the distinction between Progressives and Socialists. But that looks uncommonly like a death-bed repentance. The Progressive policy has for 18 years been a Socialist policy, and

the Progressive party has loyally adhered to it. It has not been able to realize many of the items, but it has directed its whole administration towards realizing them. For this it has manipulated the committees on the Council, because the policy, being based on *a priori* axioms without regard to results, would not bear close examination and criticism by those who do not blindly accept it. For this it has been necessary to cajole the electors by including among the results all kinds of services rendered by some one else and benefits which the party has not conferred. For this it has neglected plain duties, which do not subserve the policy, and has piled up debts which delay or prevent the execution of urgent work and will not apparently bear the test of a plain financial statement.

The Progressive programmes, it is to be noted, ignore the duties actually entrusted to the Council ; they do not promise or urge the efficient and economical administration of public affairs, which should be its first care, but are wholly devoted to hypothetical schemes which lie within the competence of Parliament alone. And those are the lines on which the business of the Council has been conducted by the party in power.



**February 6, 1907.**

#### **IV.**

The simplest way to examine the actual work done by the County Council is to assume the character of a stranger—say from some foreign country—visiting the English metropolis to investigate its administration with an appreciative but critical eye. After a good look round, not at “the sights,” but at the streets, the dwellings, and the people, in order to get a general idea, the first question he would ask is—What is your death-rate? For the most exact, and at the same time the most general, measure of well-being is furnished by vital statistics. Thereupon he will have handed to him a report by the medical officer to the County Council containing full statistical and other information relating to public health, compiled with great care and knowledge. And here the remark may be interjected that the Council is to be complimented on its statistical work in general; the new volume of London statistics is a very valuable compilation; but these things have, of course, nothing to do with parties or politics; they are the work of executive officers. Our stranger would note with appreciation the well-arranged mass of information placed at his disposal and would proceed to digest it. He would turn at once to the general death-rate and find that it was much lower than the unfavourable appearance of large areas of the city had led him to expect. He would observe that it has fallen from 24·4 per 1,000 in 1861-70 to 16·1 per 1,000 in 1901-05, that it is lower than the death-rates of most capital cities and also the lowest death-rate in any of the 14 largest towns in England with three exceptions, one of which, he would note, to his surprise, is West Ham, which he had learnt from the newspapers to regard as the particular home of general misery, privation, and destitution. He would not exclaim, “London is the healthiest city in the world,” because he would be under no obligation to say what is not true; but he would certainly conclude that in most matters affecting public health London must have been successfully administered for a good many years. Upon inquiring into the organization by which these results have been obtained, he would learn that for administrative purposes London is divided into districts, each with its own sanitary authority, which is responsible for general sanitation—drains, scavenging, removal of refuse, nuisances, insanitary house conditions, notification of infectious disease, disinfection, &c.—and has its own executive staff of medical officers and sanitary inspectors to perform these duties, while the part of the County Council, as the central authority, is confined to supervision, with power to take action in case of default by the local authority.

He would then probably turn his attention to the special subject of infectious disease and, perceiving that the death-rate from the principal epidemic diseases had been satisfactorily reduced from 5·23 in 1861-70 to 2·0 in 1901-05, would wish to know how isolation is carried out in such a vast population, which must have much endemic disease always present and be constantly liable to epidemic outbreaks. The facts with regard to this important department of public health are that the notification of cases and disinfection of premises, bedding, &c., after removal, are carried out by the sanitary staffs of the local councils, and the removal and isolation of patients by the Metropolitan Asylums Board, a distinct central body, over which the County Council has no jurisdiction at all. It was created in 1867, and opened its first fever hospital in 1870, since when its work has continually grown. In 1904 it maintained 11 hospitals with an aggregate of over 5,000 beds, to which 19,000 patients were admitted in the course of the year. The principal diseases dealt with are scarlet fever, diphtheria, typhoid fever, and smallpox ; and the great diminution in the zymotic death-rate, particularly that of scarlet fever, must be attributed in a large measure to its operations. The Board is by far the largest agency for the isolation and treatment of infectious disease in the world, and a visit to its ambulance stations and hospitals could not fail to excite the admiration of our intelligent stranger, who would certainly pronounce them second to none and worthy of London. The only criticism he would be likely to make is that some of the hospitals are needlessly palatial and costly.

The next point likely to engage his attention is the water supply. He would learn the following facts from the statistics—that the mortality from those intestinal disorders which are commonly called water-borne has markedly diminished in recent years ; that the death-rate from typhoid fever, in particular, has fallen from 24 per 100,000 in 1871-80 to 8·4 in 1901-5, and in the last year was only 5, as against 10 in Liverpool, 9 in Manchester, and 7 in Birmingham and Glasgow ; that in general London compares favourably with most great towns in respect of this class of disease, and that for many years no outbreak has been traced to the water. These facts prove that the quality of the London water cannot be bad, and they establish a *prima facie* probability that it is exceptionally good. But the well-informed foreigner would reflect that a dangerous water supply may be used with impunity for years and then suddenly be the cause of a great catastrophe, and he would want to know about the sources and the precautions taken to ensure safety. He would learn that the bulk of the water is taken from the Thames, which is liable to considerable pollution, but that it is subjected to sand filtration and constantly examined not only on behalf of those responsible for it, but by Government experts appointed for the purpose. He would further learn that the risk of pollution is being steadily

diminished by purifying the river and improving the treatment of the water by means of subsidence reservoirs and filtration, and that the whole question of the London water supply has been in recent years the subject of repeated public inquiries by the most eminent scientific authorities, who have always reported favourably upon it, while making suggestions for its improvement, which have been adopted. When, a few years ago, the supply was transferred from private companies to a public authority and it became necessary to value the undertakings, the excellent condition of the existing plant was officially acknowledged and full value allowed.

Putting together the foregoing facts, which cannot be gainsaid, the inquirer could not fail to come to the conclusion that London is well served by the several agencies mentioned. This system works very fairly, he would say ; after all, these English are still a practical people. But there remains one other very important feature of sanitary administration, which is entrusted to the County Council. Main drainage and the disposal of sewage are not exciting topics, but they are of vast importance to the health of the community, and they constitute the first duty of the Council as an administrative body. There is no better test of its work than the manner in which it has performed this great task, and, dull as the subject is, those who wish to understand the meaning of Progressive politics in municipal work must pay attention to it.

The main drainage of London was constructed by the Metropolitan Board of Works at a cost of  $5\frac{3}{4}$  millions, and was practically completed more than 40 years ago. It was a huge undertaking, the accomplishment of which placed England in the forefront of practical sanitation. It effectually established the water-carriage system of conveying sewage as the best and most suited to modern urban conditions, and all the world has gradually been following the famous example. But drains and sewers only carry sewage away, they do not dispose of it ; in fact, main drainage increases the difficulty of dispersing the nuisance, by collecting vast quantities in one spot. The case of London soon proved that. The stuff was all run into the Thames in a concentrated form and produced an intolerable state of things near the points of discharge. The Board of Works was constrained to devise a plan for reducing the nuisance, and under expert advice it adopted a scheme for treating the crude sewage chemically, precipitating the solid matter and carrying it out to sea, so as to remove the worst impurities from the river. This scheme had been partly carried out when the County Council came into possession and inherited from the Board of Works the main drainage system, with the partly constructed plant for treating the sewage. With regard to the latter, the Council completed and carried on the scheme very much upon the original lines, under the advice of the expert who had devised it, and who

passed into the service of the Council on the abolition of the Board of Works. It has much improved the state of the river, but is not an ideal method of sewage disposal. In spite of some bacterial treatment at one of the outfalls, much of the "purified" effluent which runs into the river after removal of the sludge is anything but innocuous. It contains a great deal of sewage matter in suspension and solution, with all the sewage smell, so that at times the stench from the river at certain points is still excessively bad. The process of barging the sludge away to sea is costly. Visitors versed in these matters are not favourably impressed by the arrangement, and our inquiring foreigner would have to summon all his politeness to conceal the disappointment caused by such a makeshift method in the mother of drains, as London may be called. But the difficulties in the way of carrying out a more scientific and satisfactory method are very great; and the Council cannot be seriously blamed for adhering to the existing one. But neither can it be congratulated. The matter is not one to boast about. In any case, whatever credit is due belongs of right chiefly to the old Board of Works, which put the scheme in hand.

With regard to main drainage the case is much less favourable. When the Council took over this duty the system had already been laid some 14 years, during which a great development of building and increase of population had taken place, and the need of additional sewers and works was being felt. The Council recognized the fact during its first year, and referred the subject to the Main Drainage Committee on the ground of public health. That winter there were many complaints of flooding in low-lying districts from the inadequacy of the sewers, and fears were expressed of danger to health in addition to inconvenience and damage. The Council had been very unlucky in losing three chief engineers in succession by resignation and death during its first year; but at the beginning of 1890 the Main Drainage Committee instructed the Council's chief engineer, in consultation with Sir Benjamin Baker, to report upon the question, and urged upon them "the desirability of the utmost promptitude in making their report." In short, the matter was treated as urgent. In his annual address the Chairman (Lord Rosebery) referred to it as "the greatest problem of all."

Our main drainage works were planned for London at a time when the population of London was 2,000,000 less than it is at the present moment; that population is daily increasing, and furthermore we have places like Erith applying to be included in our main drainage system; we have, therefore, a problem before us which I do not exaggerate in describing as by far the greatest before the Council at the present time.

The engineers reported early in 1891, and said :—

We have found on investigation that the most frequent cause of public complaint is due to the insufficient size of the main outfall sewers, which has led to floodings of the low districts, and to the frequent discharge of much crude, undiluted sewage into the Thames in the heart of the metropolis. To remedy these immediate pressing evils we have proposed the construction of new intercepting sewers on both sides of the river, of sufficient size to provide for the sewage of a future population of seven millions and also for a reasonable amount of rainfall, at a cost of about 2½ millions. We are of opinion that detailed plans should be prepared of these works, and that no time should be lost in commencing such portions of them as are more immediately required.

The Council accepted the recommendation that plans should be prepared, but did not proceed to the execution of this admittedly urgent work. Nor has it been executed to this day, after the lapse of 16 years. The story is one of recurring complaints from local sanitary authorities and the public, of urgent representations by the Council's engineer, of reports by the Main Drainage Committee, and of postponement by the Council. A little tinkering was done, and that was all for many years. Certain Progressive Councillors seem to have entertained an unaccountable objection to carrying out the work. Nearly six years after the engineers had been instructed to use "the utmost promptitude" and had reported on the "immediate pressing evils," these gentlemen came forward and moved a resolution that the enlargement of the sewerage system, recommended by the engineers and accepted by the Council, was "not now necessary"; and they got their resolution passed in the teeth of the engineer's statement that "he was more strongly impressed than ever with the necessity of immediately proceeding with these works." Some trifling work had been done to the amount of £165,000, and that was considered sufficient for "by far the greatest problem before the Council." Four more years elapsed, and again the same responsible officer endeavoured to do his duty by urging the construction of sewage works at an estimated cost of nearly three millions. His advice was endorsed by the Main Drainage Committee, which reported :—

For a long time past serious complaints have been made of the insufficiency of the main sewers in the various parts of London, and our attention has been frequently directed to the dangers arising to public health from the periodical flooding of dwelling-houses and other buildings with storm waters and sewage. The duty of providing means for the drainage of the metropolis is undoubtedly one of the principal duties committed

to the charge of the Council, and the manner in which the Council fulfils its obligation in seeing that this work is effectually done is, and must be, a matter of the utmost concern to the public.

It will hardly be believed that the same Progressive members once more endeavoured to obstruct this work, already 11 years overdue, and had the impudence to move that it was "not now necessary." However, pressure had been put on the Council by the local sanitary authorities in every part of London; and those on the north side of the river had held a conference, which—

recorded its surprise that, notwithstanding the strong expression of opinion by the Main Drainage Committee of the L.C.C. and its responsible officers and the repeated representations of vestries and district boards to the effect that the existing sewer accommodation was entirely inadequate to carry out the work required of it, no attempt should have been made to abate the intolerable nuisance complained of.

The Council was in this way brought to its bearings by the other authorities. The obstructionists failed to carry their point, and works to the extent of £1,250,000 were authorized. That was in 1899, but some years elapsed before any considerable instalment was executed. Down to the end of the financial year 1904 little more than one-fourth of the amount had been expended; in 1904-5 the amount spent on main drainage extension was £368,000, and in 1905-6 it was £461,000. But the worst of the long delay is that requirements have been accumulating all these years, and so much more remains to be done that the Council dares not face the expenditure. The total cost of the required drainage and flood relief works is estimated to be £4,795,000, which leaves over 3½ millions still to be spent. But the Council is not in a financial position to undertake this. Why? For the reasons given by the Finance Committee in 1905:—

The Council is already definitely committed to exceptional capital expenditure in these years, including the large outlay that will be necessary for the electrification of the northern tramways, and we feel that it would be most desirable, in the best financial interests of the Council, that in these years large expenditure under other heads should not, if possible, be incurred. We therefore view with some concern the possibility of the requirements for main drainage being increased to the extent indicated above. It has been represented to us that the works already completed, or now in progress, will be useless until further outlay is incurred for their completion, but we feel that is equally true of any work of such magnitude, and that, with every desire to see the work



completed as early as possible, the Council cannot afford to disregard the financial considerations involved.

Of course it cannot ; the committee is quite right. So we reach this conclusion ; the first duty of the Council, declared urgent in its first year, still unperformed after 17 years ; the expenditure already incurred useless until the work is completed, and completion indefinitely postponed because of the Council's financial commitments in other directions. It is not a creditable record for London ; it is a very discreditable one. What would County Councillors think, if they went to Berlin, for instance, and found such a tale of neglect ? What judgment would they pass upon it ? What judgment is passed when ever a similar story comes to light, as at Lincoln, for instance, two years ago ? That is the judgment that any stranger would pass upon them ; and we owe it entirely to the Progressive policy. Main drainage is a dull and repellent thing ; there is no glamour about it, nothing of the guardian angel ; it makes no show, it is not " ideal " ; it is only real and vitally important. So we have bands in the parks, " steam yachts," as Sir J. W. Benn has happily called them, on the river, empty trams on the Embankment, and sewage in the basement. The Councillor who took the lead in opposing the main drainage works at the same time distinguished himself by taking charge of his neighbour's morals. Purity in the music-hall and sewage in the home ! It is a burlesque of local government. Does the reader know what sewage in the house, including the bakehouse, means ? It would be easy to write a sickening description of it. About 15 years ago I remember having to describe this very thing, not in London, but in Grimsby ; and a day or two afterwards I saw the placards of a Progressive paper all over London announcing " Shocking Disclosures at Grimsby," meaning my description, which was quoted with appropriate comments. It made me smile as I thought of half-a-dozen districts in London, each twice or three times as large as Grimsby, where the same thing occurs.

If the public health of London is good, very little thanks are due to the County Council ; and the limits of patience are reached when this body, which has so scandalously neglected the one great public health duty entrusted to it, and only took up the work eventually when driven to do so by the despised vestries, claims all the credit and demands that the functions of the other bodies, which have served London well, should be handed over to its mismanagement. To Progressive politicians the proof of the pudding is not in the eating, but in the nationality or the name of the cook.

**February 13, 1907.**

## **V.**

The function of local administration next in importance to those concerned with public health in general is the treatment of particular spots technically known as insanitary areas and more familiarly as "slums." They are streets or courts consisting of houses which are unfit to live in, according to prevailing notions of health, on account of dilapidation, damp, and dirt. In regard to this matter, the appearance of a large part of London makes an extremely unfavourable impression upon the Continental visitor, who is not accustomed to the sight of so much squalor ; and he is inclined to think that extraordinary indifference and neglect prevail. But this impression is superficial ; it is caused by the endless succession of streets consisting of mean little houses, by the universal grime and dirt, and the frequent sight of broken windows, door-handles, and the like. Much of this does not signify indifference and neglect on the part of individuals ; but if the visitor looks below the surface he will find that the forbidding exterior generally conceals more attention on the part of public authorities in regard to essential matters than he supposed, and probably more than he is accustomed to meet with behind the comparatively pleasing exterior of the streets in his native land. A mean and dirty little house may be less really insanitary than a great building with an imposing appearance, and the very multitude of mean little houses, which is so depressing to the eye in London, implies a spreading of the population over the ground which has no little hygienic value in itself. Things are not so bad as they look. Nevertheless, housing is, for various reasons, a very great and difficult problem in London. Thirty years ago it was great and urgent enough to have dismayed the stoutest heart. Many parts of the City were strewn with areas as bad as they could possibly be ; whole streets and courts of houses, rotten with age and neglect, filthy beyond description, densely crowded with people sunk in the depths of poverty, degradation, and crime. I used to explore them in the days of my youth and remember them well. The changes since effected are very remarkable. The places I remember are not all gone, but the worst of them are, and the localities are unrecognizable. Much had already been done before Mr. Booth began his investigations 20 years ago, and much has been done since. Criticism is easy and has not been lacking, but any one who knows the extent of the changes effected and the difficulty of effecting them is not much inclined to criticize ; and I confess I am not. The agencies which have contributed to the work have been numerous and some have been more successful than others. In recent years the County Council has from its

position necessarily been the most prominent, and it has been active. It has done its duty by insanitary housing far better than by main drainage, and if it were content to let the matter rest as non-political every one else would gladly do so; but since all the credit is claimed, as usual, for the Progressive policy, it becomes necessary to examine the record.

Legislation dealing with housing goes back as far as 1851 (Lord Shaftesbury's Act), but little was done before 1875; since then the work has been actively and continuously carried on. It is not necessary to trouble the reader with details of the various Acts which have contributed to it, but one fact must be mentioned because it is constantly forgotten. All the principal Acts under which improvements in housing have been effected were passed under the Conservative Governments of Lord Beaconsfield and Lord Salisbury. During the second Ministry of the latter the important consolidating Act of 1890, which is still the principal Act, was passed, and the most important amendments made since were passed in Lord Salisbury's third Ministry (1900) and Mr. Balfour's Ministry (1903). Legal power is the indispensable lever of action, and in regard to housing improvement we owe practically none of it to Progressive politics.

Under the powers thus conferred by those who are supposed to be the enemies of progress, the metropolitan authorities have since 1875 dealt with 45 insanitary areas covering 105 acres in the centre, south, east, and north of London. For a small portion of this—namely, ten areas covering eight acres—a number of borough councils are responsible, but the duty of dealing with larger areas is placed by the law upon the central authority, formerly the Board of Works, now the County Council. The clearance of insanitary areas has practically been done by these two. Between 1876 and 1889 the Board of Works carried out 17 schemes and initiated six others, one of which was dropped; between 1889 and the present time the County Council has carried out ten schemes, including five inherited from the Board of Works, and initiated eight others. The total area of the improvements initiated by the two authorities respectively is:—Board of Works, 57·24 acres; County Council, 40·00 acres. Of course, as improvements of this kind proceed, the scope of operations diminishes and one may naturally expect a contraction of results; but the fact remains that the Board of Works actually initiated improvements covering a considerably larger area than the County Council has done in a considerably longer period. If both are credited with the schemes completed and begun, or with those completed only, the advantage still lies with the older body. Turning to the population of these areas, we find a still greater difference in the same direction. The working-class population occupying the whole area before clearance was 45,437; the number affected by the Board of Works completed schemes was

24,100, by the County Council completed schemes 12,749, by all the Board of Works schemes, completed and initiated, 29,004, and by all the County Council schemes 21,337. If the schemes initiated wholly by the Council are taken the number is only 16,433, against 29,004.

These facts, taken from the Council's own official statistics, effectually dispose of the claim, advanced by the Progressive party, to the whole credit for London improvements. The more that claim is examined by any one who cares nothing about parties or theories, but simply looks at the facts, the more preposterous does it become. One can only suppose that those who advance it are themselves ignorant of the facts or rely upon the ignorance of their hearers. Mr. Sydney Buxton, for instance, speaking at Poplar on February 5, compared the improved London of to-day with "the London he remembered under the unrepresentative Board of Works," as if no improvements had been effected until the advent of the County Council; whereas the plain truth is that not only in regard to insanitary areas, but also in street improvements and the provision of parks and open spaces, more was done under the Board than has since been done under the Council. The reputation of the Board of Works is nothing to me; let us grant, for the sake of argument, that it was as incompetent as Mr. Sydney Buxton and others allege. But, if so, what becomes of the reputation of the County Council, which has done less for improvement with larger powers?

The net cost to the ratepayers of clearance schemes up to March, 1905, was £2,422,131, and the estimated cost of all schemes undertaken up to the present time, including those of the borough councils, is £2,606,080, of which £1,372,609 was incurred by the Board of Works.

The clearance of insanitary areas, however, is only half the battle, and not the most difficult half. There is the troublesome question of rehousing the displaced population. The policy of the Board of Works was to offer the land to private corporations, philanthropic or commercial, for the erection of working-class dwellings, and this plan resulted in the provision of accommodation for a larger number than had been displaced. In the schemes carried out by the Board the total working-class population displaced was 24,100, and accommodation was provided for 26,808. [These figures appear to be differently stated in different official returns; they are given in another return as 24,207 displaced and 27,066 rehoused.] The Council, on the other hand, appears to have had two policies. At first it tried to follow the example of its predecessor, but with very little success; purchasers could not be found for most of the sites. The reasons for this failure are not given; it would be interesting to know if a Progressive policy was at all responsible for it. At any rate, the Council, being under a statutory obligation to rehouse at least half the people displaced by any improvement

scheme, adopted the policy of erecting its own buildings. The net result of its ten completed schemes is 12,749 displaced and accommodation for 8,142 provided. To put it another way, while the Board of Works increased the number of rooms from 10,445 to 14,455, the Council reduced 6,172 rooms to 4,909.

It is difficult to estimate the respective gain or loss to the community produced by these changes. When accommodation is diminished the people are less thick on the ground at that spot, but demand is increased in the neighbourhood, and with it, doubtless, rents and overcrowding. On the whole, the results produced by such bodies as the Peabody Trust are certainly better than those of the County Council. The rents of dwellings erected under the Board of Works policy are appreciably less than the County Council's; the former average 2s. 7d. per room per week, being an increase of 4½d.; the latter average 2s. 11½d., being an increase of 8½d. Where does the benefit to the poor come in here? It is often said that, when insanitary areas are cleared and improved housing erected in place of that demolished, the persons who occupy the new buildings are not those dispossessed, but of a superior class. That is true, and it is probably more true of the Council's dwellings than of others; but I do not think there is much in the complaint. It seems to me an inevitable process. During demolition the old inhabitants are dispersed; they go elsewhere, often miles away. For instance, there are streets near Earl's-court, at Fulham, Parson's-green, and Hammersmith, where considerable numbers of the persons turned out by the Spitalfields improvements took refuge. They go to the places which suits them best, and those are the cheapest and worst; for the areas selected for demolition are those in the worst condition and occupied by the lowest classes. Their dispersal is a good thing for them and everybody; they are more distributed among superior neighbours, less able to keep each other in countenance, and so are insensibly led to conform, more or less, to a higher standard. If they all returned to their old quarters, they would soon make it nearly as bad as ever. When they do return, that happens; but as a rule they do not. The improved dwellings do not suit them so well as the places they have found meanwhile, which are more like their old quarters. On the other hand, the persons who do come to the new dwellings are those naturally attracted by the locality and the accommodation; those, in short, most suited to it. But when we speak of housing the poor we must remember that the first of all considerations to them is the rent; and therein the Board of Works certainly did better than the Council. In rehousing the poor after clearances, then, the Council has not been conspicuously successful. But it is also under obligations to rehouse for displacements on account of street improvements and other public works apart from insanitary areas. On that score it has erected dwellings containing 2,405 tenements and

5,985 rooms, but about these very little information is available. Some of them form part of the Council's housing schemes, which must be distinguished from rehousing. The latter is a statutory obligation when people are displaced, but the law also gives the Council power to build working-class dwellings independently of displacements. It was not until the end of 1898 that the Council decided to put this power into force, although the problem had long been acute. At the same time it decided in future to provide accommodation for all persons displaced by improvements, and the two things have gone together. Down to March, 1905, the number of rooms provided was 2,378 in seven localities; and other schemes were projected representing 32,705 additional rooms. Most of these schemes are on sites at a distance from the more congested central parts of London, and some are outside the county altogether. The largest are at Tooting (Totterdown-fields), Norbury, Wood-green (White Hart-lane), and Hammersmith (Old Oak-common). They have proceeded very slowly. The Tooting scheme, the first of its kind, was passed at the beginning of 1900; it provided for the purchase of  $38\frac{1}{2}$  acres on which cottages were to be erected to house 8,432. According to the latest statistics the accommodation already provided is only for 2,124. The Norbury scheme was passed at the end of 1900; the site is 31 acres and the accommodation contemplated is for 5,800 persons. In February, 1906, the first block was completed with housing for 68 persons. The Wood-green scheme is by far the largest of all; the estate is  $225\frac{1}{2}$  acres, and the eventual accommodation is intended to be for 42,500 persons. At present, after about five years, it only appears to have got as far as to provide for about 1,000. The Hammersmith scheme (50 acres) is still less advanced.

So far, municipal housing has done very little towards solving the problem. The following table from "London Statistics," showing the accommodation provided by several agencies in regard to both rehousing and housing, is instructive;—

#### REHOUSING.

Agency.					No. of Rooms Provided.
London County Council	...	...	...	...	12,718
Local authorities	...	...	...	...	1,697
Trusts, public companies, and persons	...	...	...	...	20,424
Railway and other companies	...	...	...	...	8,201
Total	...	...	...	...	43,040

## HOUSING.

Agency.					No. of Rooms Provided.
London County Council	...	...	...	...	2,378
Local authorities	.....	...	...	...	4,272
Trusts, public companies, and private persons	...	...	...	...	84,522
Total					91,172

In rehousing, then, municipal agencies have provided 14,415 rooms, private enterprise 28,625; in housing their respective figures are 6,650 and 84,522. The totals are—municipal agencies, 21,065; private enterprise, 113,147. Private enterprise here only covers certain large concerns, some of which are philanthropic (Guinness Trust and Peabody Fund) and some commercial; the largest of the latter class are the Artizans', Labourers', and General Dwellings Company (Limited) and the Improved Industrial Dwellings Company (Limited). Individual efforts, represented by less than 200 rooms, are not included. So far as the problem concerns the poor in particular—and the poor are the *crux* of it—municipal effort is still less successful; is, indeed, a total failure. The rents are far too high, in some cases too high for skilled men in good work, and hopelessly out of the reach of married labourers. The average rent of all the County Council's buildings is 2s. 11d. per room; but even that, enough as it is, is deceptive. In nearly half their dwellings the average is over 3s.; in five of them it is 3s. 6d. or above, and in one it is over 4s. For some of the single-roomed tenements the rent is 4s. 6d., 5s., and even 6s., and for some of the double-roomed tenements 7s., 8s., and 9s. These are the more centrally-situated dwellings; on the Millbank estate, which is one of the principal housing schemes in London, but not central, the rent of tenements is—one room, 4s. 6d. and 5s.; two rooms, 6s. to 8s. 6d.; three rooms, 8s. to 10s. 6d.; four rooms, 12s. to 13s. Let us compare this with the latest dwellings erected by the municipality in Liverpool, the only town in England that has done much in the way of housing besides London—one room, 2s. and 2s. 6d.; two rooms, 2s. 9d. to 3s. 6d.; three rooms, 4s. to 4s. 6d.; four rooms, 4s. 6d. to 5s. 3d. The average rent per room is 1s. 6d., against 2s. 11d. in London, or just about one-half. And these are not on the outskirts of the town, but fairly central, besides being of excellent quality. When all allowance for difference of local prices is made, the County Council rents are clearly higher than they need be or ought to be. The average weekly rent per room for other new working-class dwellings in and

about London is 2s. 4d.; that is to say, the County Council rents are 25 per cent. higher than the commercial rents. And it must be remembered that these dwellings are built under stringent regulations and trade union wages are paid by the builders. The Council has certainly been extravagant, and for that the Progressive policy is responsible. Lord Carrington has just told us that when the Council decided to begin housing in 1898 he endeavoured to get the Housing Committee composed entirely of Progressives, but was overruled; there was "a fair sprinkling of Moderates, but they were not numerous enough to do them any harm"; otherwise, to interfere with their policy. That is a very interesting admission.

The result of the high rents is that the tenements are impossible to the poor, and apparently too dear even for superior working-class families. Although the housing schemes have made such slow progress, there has been in some of them a difficulty in letting the few cottages erected; and empty houses have added to the current cost. Many of the schemes are worked at a loss, and the profit on the others did not suffice to make good the deficiency in the financial year ended March, 1905, when the net deficiency on working was £1,097 (London Statistics). In the following year the report of the Housing Committee showed a surplus of £2,661 on all dwellings in occupation, making, with interest on cash balances, a total surplus of £3,346. Let us hope that things are improving. Nevertheless, the same report states that a net contribution of £39,084 had been made from the rates up to that date. It is, however, extremely doubtful, to say the least, if these accounts represent the true financial position. It appears that the Housing Committee has in recent years adopted the practice of writing down the value of sites to *nil* and charging it to some other account, in order to avoid showing a deficiency; and that even that peculiar financial transaction has not sufficed to meet the case. The Finance Committee in its report of July last drew attention to this and to the remarks of the auditor that—

In the year 1904-5 there were three cases in which the Council charged as the value of the site sums less than the valuer's estimate. . . . He states that he has passed the accounts as submitted to him, but trusts "that the Council will give instructions for transfers representing full housing value to be made between the different accounts, as it would appear that the dwellings' capital account has been considerably undercharged."

The Finance Committee's report then goes on to refer to the rehousing in connexion with Rotherhithe Tunnel in 1902. A site was secured for £12,000, and the valuer placed its value for housing purposes at £1,000.



The Housing of the Working Classes Committee, however, estimated that even if the site were to be taken as of no value, they could not build dwellings upon it without showing a deficiency, and they asked that the dwellings scheme should be subsidized by a payment out of the Rotherhithe Tunnel capital account of the amount of this estimated deficiency - viz., £397. . . . The Council decided on July 29, 1902, that the value of the land should be taken at *nil* and that capital subsidy should be made of £397.

The Housing Committee now point out that in spite of the fact that these dwellings are built in the most economical manner possible, they leave, even with the subsidy in question, an annual loss to the Council.

The same report refers to another case, in which the value of the land was taken at *nil*, and in addition the dwellings' account was credited with £6,535, which was the sum estimated by the Housing Committee to be required "to preserve equilibrium"; in this case the value of the site for housing purposes was put by the valuer at £3,050, so that nearly £10,000 was knocked off the housing account and put upon the rates.

"To preserve equilibrium" is a good phrase; but in view of these transactions the less said about profits on housing the better. It is impossible to accept the accounts with confidence. In regard to the Bourne rehousing scheme, the report of the Royal Commission on London Traffic points out that in consequence of the writing down policy "there is a loss of very nearly £60 per head of the persons housed, and the whole of this loss falls on the rates." That estimate was based on the assumption that 2,640 persons were housed, but the actual number given in London Statistics is 1,005, so that the loss is over £150 per head. Yet, after this, the average rent is 3s. 5½d. per room. Of all the agencies which have attempted housing, the County Council has most conspicuously failed. The contrast between its performance and its promises is positively ludicrous.



**February 21, 1907.**

## **VI.**

Street improvements are a matter of even more general importance than insanitary areas and housing, with which they are logically and actually connected. Many of the clearance schemes discussed in the last article have been associated with the formation of new streets, and even when this has not been done old streets have generally been widened. But street improvement is also a subject by itself, requiring separate treatment. Its object is different ; it is concerned primarily with locomotion, and, secondarily, with beautification, though it also has a bearing on public health. It has been universally recognized for half a century, at least, as a crying need in London, the inhabitants of which daily attempt to put more traffic through narrower streets than in any other western city in existence. The process is slow ; but it has gone on ; a great deal of money has been spent on it and substantial results have been obtained. But here, again, though one feels inclined to apologize for repeating the same tale, the facts are so constantly misrepresented in order to bolster up the Progressive platform that it is necessary to point out once more that we do not owe the greater part of the improvements to the County Council at all, and that in what we do owe to it the Progressive policy has been more hindrance than help. Apart from the Embankment, which is by far the greatest of all, 16 large improvements were carried out by the Board of Works, including Shaftesbury-avenue, with the enlargement of Piccadilly-circus, Charing-cross-road, Northumberland-avenue, Queen Victoria-street, Southwark-street, Clerkenwell-road, and Commercial-road ; and it bequeathed the completion of Rosebery-avenue to the County Council. The work of the Board was distinguished by the number of new arterial thoroughfares which it drove through dense and squalid regions. The work of the Council, on the other hand, has been chiefly confined to widening existing thoroughfares. It is a useful and necessary work, but when " imagination " is claimed as the distinctive merit of the Council's proceedings, we are entitled to ask where it comes in. There is certainly more imagination in planning new streets than in widening old ones, which is a rule of thumb business. In truth the really distinctive quality of Progressive administration is not imagination, which does not guide or shape its operations, but merely furnishes arguments in support of them. The one notable exception to the Council's comparatively meagre contributions to street improvement is the Holborn-Strand scheme. It is a fine bit of work, but over-praised ; and the point in which the design fails is precisely want of imagination. The crescentic

ending towards the Strand gives no vista. So long as these new streets lie open with the ground unbuilt upon (a dead burden to the rates) they look broad and spacious ; but when the view is barred by the buildings, which must eventually come, the disposition of the streets will be found to have a very unfortunate effect. They will look as if they led to nowhere, and will not attract, for it is the vista that draws people on. The uninviting back-water appearance cannot fail to exercise an injurious influence upon the commercial value of the property, and probably this is one of the reasons why so much difficulty is experienced in letting the ground, to the heavy loss of the ratepayers.

The Council might have done a good deal more than it has and might have carried out some improvements at considerably less cost, if it had not wasted several years in pursuing certain Progressive principles. The Improvements Committee kept bringing up proposals and pressing them as urgent, but the Council kept putting them off until Parliament could be induced to sanction the Progressive theory of "betterment," or the taxation of ground values, as is related in one of the Council's publications (*History of London Street Improvements*, by P. J. Edwards, clerk to the Improvements Committee) :—

The Council accordingly resolved to postpone all new loans for permanent improvements which could be postponed without grave inconvenience "until Parliament should have provided that the burden of all loans for such improvements should fall upon such persons as the law should hereinafter direct, all private contracts to the contrary notwithstanding." The Improvements Committee, being of opinion that many of the proposed improvements under consideration were of pressing necessity and were such as could not be postponed without grave inconvenience, continued to submit proposals to the Council for adoption, but all the schemes, with one or two exceptions, were referred back to the committee.

Thus the interests of the public were sacrificed to theory. The belief that vast sums can be obtained for the benefit of the public by taxing ground values is one of the numerous economic fallacies that have an irresistible attraction for some minds ; it has been disproved again and again, *a posteriori* and *a priori*, by experience and by reason, but is still tenaciously held, or assumed for electioneering purposes. Parliament has hitherto declined to fall into the snare, and the attitude of the present Government towards it is highly ambiguous. If improvements are to be postponed until this dream is realized, they will have to wait a long time. There is much more to be said for "betterment." The principle is unassailable that, if the value of property is increased by specific improvements carried

out at the public cost, the owners who benefit thereby should contribute towards it. The "betterment" plan is to levy an improvement charge on the enhanced value, which is arrived at by assessment. But there is another way of securing the enhanced value for the public, and that is by the public's becoming the owner of the property to be improved, or a considerable part of it. This is called reconpment, and it was advocated by the Moderate party on the Council, but opposed by the Progressives. It is the more practical plan of the two, as events have proved. Its adoption was one of the results of the election of 1895, which brought the Moderates back in strength and enabled them to exercise some influence in the direction of a more practical administration of affairs. After that the inactivity of the Council ceased, and large schemes which had been delayed for years were put in hand. The change may be seen in the budget for improvements. In the previous six years the estimated cost of improvements sanctioned by the Council was £620,000; in the following six years it was £4,330,000. In Progressive reports the change is ascribed to the approval given by Parliament to the principle of betterment in 1895; but the betterment sanctioned by Parliament was not that demanded by the Council, and, as a matter of fact, it has been applied to only a small extent. The most important improvements have been carried out on the reconpment plan, which found a strong advocate in Mr. Shaw Lefevre, now Lord Eversley. Though a Progressive, he was not a fanatic, and he not only recognized the advantages of the plan advocated by the Moderates, but, when he was chairman of the Improvements Committee, he got it carried with their help, in the teeth of a determined opposition from Progressives. He has himself given an account of it in *The Times*, and borne testimony to the value of reconpment, in a letter published in October, 1905, in which he said:—

I may explain that the Westminster improvement, like that of the new Kingsway and Aldwych, and also the Kensington High-street widening, was based on the acquisition of a very wide area of reconpment, by which it was hoped to recover a great part, if not the whole, of the cost of the scheme—a new departure as an alternative to the abortive principle of "betterment," and to which I attributed the highest importance in its bearing on future schemes of street improvements in London.

That this valuable and fruitful principle was opposed on party grounds by the Progressives, and carried only with difficulty, is clear from what follows:—

I must admit that I committed what was naturally considered by many of my friends of the Progressive party an

unpardonable offence, from a party point of view, in accepting the support of the Moderate party and carrying it largely by their aid. The result of the scheme as now apparent from the *bona fide* offer of the syndicate has far exceeded my most sanguine hopes.

Here is an illustration—one out of many—of the way in which party administration by Progressives runs counter to public interests. The business of the Council is to adopt whatever plan gives the best results; yet a respected and influential Progressive is held to have committed “an unpardonable offence” in advocating on those grounds a plan which is not the party plan. There is no reason why both betterment and recompment should not be applied according to circumstance, but, because recompment is not in the Progressive bible—otherwise “the London Programme”—it is to be opposed tooth and nail, although it not only produces better results, but is actually more in accordance with the principle of public ownership. Can stupidity and blind following of the blind go further? It appears that Progressive stupidity can. The syndicate, whose offer Mr. Lefevre referred to above as so advantageous, consisted of gentlemen of the most unimpeachable standing and ability, and the offer was recommended, though reluctantly, for acceptance by the Improvements Committee; but it met with strong opposition from Progressive members, who made a determined attempt to secure its rejection on purely theoretical grounds. Lord Welby, however, uttered one of the grave warnings which have distinguished his conduct of the Council’s finance. He “implored the members to pause and consider that they were the guardians of the public purse and to realize the responsibilities that guardianship entailed. He hoped the Council would not adopt the quixotic proposal of Mr. Hubbard and add to the already enormous commitments of the Council.” His sound advice was not without effect, and eventually the scheme was passed, though not until the debate had been adjourned and several amendments rejected, including one which would have fettered the acceptance of the offer; it was moved by a Progressive member, who, “as an advocate of land nationalization, could be no party to the acquisition of land by a private body, which was moreover a dangerous precedent,” and it was only defeated by a narrow majority in a full Council. This is interesting as showing how Socialist theories are allowed to influence the business of the Council. What has land nationalization to do with a plain business transaction on the part of an administrative body?

The reluctance to accept a good offer in one case was paralleled by the curious readiness to accept a bad one in another, namely, the “Paris in London” project for the Strand site. This extraordinary fiasco was due less to Progressive fancies than to sheer lack of business capacity, but throughout the history of

the Council the two are found to go together. The Improvements Committee accepted an offer from a "French syndicate" and the Council ratified the agreement without requiring any guarantee, or even knowing who composed the syndicate. Sir M. Beachcroft, the leader of the Moderate party, drew attention to the extraordinarily unbusinesslike character of the proposal and moved that it be referred back; but in vain. About three months later the agreement had to be rescinded, as the syndicate failed to pay a deposit. Such was the humiliating end of a project which had blocked the way for other offers for 19 months. Even if the syndicate had been able to carry the bargain through, there was an obstacle in the form of a lease of part of the premises still held by a tenant, which had been overlooked by some extraordinary blunder. The debate on that occasion is interesting on account of the statement by a Progressive member with regard to the (still) unlet land in the Holborn improvement:—

I am told in the City by builders that it is absolutely impossible to do business with this Council, the moment they approach them it is a matter of conditions. I know of a case in which people are prepared to build a block of offices on one of our vacant sites and they are met with impossible demands in regard to the ground-rent. They are asked for a ground-rent equal to a sum which I should not like to pay for a lease of the whole block of buildings.

Most of the ground still remains vacant and the interest on the dead debt, which Lord Welby said, in October, 1905, was £120,000 a year, has to come out of the rates. In addition to that, the City of Westminster authorities estimate that they have lost up to date over £71,000 in rates on the vacant land. No one can pretend that this business has been well managed, but it is nothing compared with the bungling in the case of an unimportant improvement at Fulham, in connexion with which £64,000 was paid for one-seventeenth of an acre. Land nationalization at the rate of £1,088,000 an acre! To convince the reader that there is no mistake, here is Lord Welby's statement:—

The end of the whole transaction is that we paid £64,000 for 1-17th of an acre. That is all we have got out of it. Mr. Hubbard (chairman of the Improvements Committee), in answer to objections, says, You wanted the land. That is to say, that he justifies whatever amount of money might be asked for this piece of land. If you happened to want it, you are to pay for it. On behalf of the Finance Committee, we, at all events, consider that you can buy too dear. We thought it a great deal too dear in this instance. I venture to think it is the most

astounding transaction that ever came before the Council, (May 29, 1906.)

Perhaps the most astounding, but essentially characteristic of Progressive administration, and quite in keeping with other transactions. The Chairman of the Improvements Committee, poor man, had to endure some hard knocks from other colleagues besides Lord Welby in regard to this case and also the "Paris in London" fiasco; but he naturally replied in a plaintive tone—"What terrible offence have we committed?" The real offence was that their blunders could not be covered up or brazened out; but other committees have played the fool, to use plain language, in much the same way and from the same inherent defect—sheer business incapacity. There is, for instance, the Bridges Committee, whose work in regard to new bridges is analogous to that of the Improvements Committee in regard to new streets, and should therefore be mentioned here. The story of the rebuilding of Vauxhall-bridge is a chapter of blunders worthy to rank with those related above; but to tell it in detail would be tedious. The old bridge was condemned as dangerous in 1892. An Act was obtained in 1895 authorizing the construction of a new bridge. The order to begin work was given in 1898, and the bridge should have been finished in March, 1901. It was actually opened for traffic, though not completed, in May, 1906, five years after the expected date, 11 years after the authorizing Act had been obtained, and 14 years after the formal condemnation of the old bridge. The original estimate was £484,000; the actual cost will be about £600,000. The estimate included £74,000 for acquiring property, and that has been exceeded by £57,000; also £30,000 for a temporary bridge, and that was exceeded by £8,745. When it was seen that the estimates on these accounts were to be largely exceeded, the hope was held out that £30,000 would be saved on the new bridge, but that estimate has proved still more fallacious, for instead of a saving of £30,000 there has been an additional loss of £50,000. These bald facts might be filled in by numerous specific blunders with regard to the design of the bridge, which was twice changed, the acquisition of approaches and the letting of contracts; but the length of time taken by this not very formidable undertaking and the excess of cost over the estimates are sufficient evidence of incapacity. Vauxhall-bridge is the only large work of the kind as yet undertaken by the Council, and we may be thankful for it. Londoners commonly believe that the Tower-bridge was built by the Council, because Progressive speakers and newspapers credit it with every improvement; but that valuable addition to London's highways, which really does show some imagination, is the work of the effete City Corporation. Lambeth-bridge has for years been so unsafe that traffic has had to be restricted, and in 1893 the Council thought that it "must

be rebuilt at the earliest moment," but that moment has not yet come. The bridge has been put off, like the main drainage, because of "the heavy capital expenditure to which the Council is committed." As the estimated cost is £872,000, which we might expect by analogy to swell to £1,100,000 under a Progressive administration, there is cause for thankfulness in the delay. If progress in the cost of works between estimate and execution is the sort of progress Londoners want, no one can contest the claim of the Progressive party to their confidence.

There is another point in connexion with Vauxhall-bridge which deserves attention. In various official reports the estimated cost shows extraordinary discrepancies. In some it is stated as £454,000, in others as £484,000, and in one (annual report 1895, p. 16) as £380,000. Such discrepancies occur too often in the official documents to be attributed to mere clerical errors, which would be sufficiently reprehensible. It appears that, when it is desired to recommend some project, a low estimate is named; when the cost is found to exceed the estimate, then a higher sum is put forward.





**February 25, 1907.**

## **VII.**

Of the more important public services compulsorily laid upon the Council, as distinguished from those which it takes upon itself, we have discussed three—main drainage, insanitary housing, and street improvements. There remain three others—namely, parks and open spaces, fire prevention, and education. The first two of these need not detain us long. They are, happily, non-contentious duties, which have not been administered on party lines. It would be sufficient to congratulate the Council upon the results and to leave them were it not for the persistent attempts to make party capital for the Progressives out of them. The electors are told, "Look at the parks and gardens and the fire brigade; see what we have done for you! If you put the other men in, they will take away the parks and gardens and reduce the fire brigade." It is not likely that any electors are sufficiently imbecile to believe the latter part of this electioneering nonsense, but a good many may be taken in by the former, and really believe that they owe the open spaces of London and the fire brigade solely to the efforts of the Progressive party. It is quite possible that some members of the party, after long breathing the vainglorious atmosphere which has enveloped Spring Gardens for several years, may believe it themselves. But a very brief examination of the facts will show that it has no foundation.

With regard to parks and open spaces, accessible to the public, in and round the metropolis, we are extraordinarily fortunate. This is the one feature in which London excels all other cities. In number and extent, and still more in variety and diffusion, they are unrivalled and even unapproached. The unique thing about them is their distribution all over and all round the town. Other cities have large and famous parks, but the amount of open space is concentrated in a few spots, and elsewhere there is nothing. London has the large areas too, and more of them than any other city, but it also has an immense number of small ones scattered about in every direction; they are not equally distributed, but no part is without them. Many of them have great charm and interest, though but little known to the public. This happy possession, to which justice has never been done either by visitors or by residents, has been acquired by degrees and through the operation of many agencies, public and private. The London County Council has done its share, and done it well, but it is only one among a number, and not the most important. The following table, compiled from "London Statistics," gives the bare facts with regard to the principal agencies and their respective shares in maintaining

what is the greatest merit of London as a city and ought to be its greatest pride :—

#### PARKS, &C., IN AND ABOUT LONDON.

Owned or maintained by	Number.	Area in Acres.
Government ... ..	13	3,977
City Corporation ... ..	13	6,491 $\frac{3}{8}$
London County Council ... ..	108	4,945 $\frac{3}{8}$
Borough Councils ... ..	153	264 $\frac{3}{4}$
Total ... ..	287	15,678 $\frac{1}{2}$

This table does not, by any means, represent the whole of London's possessions in open spaces, but only those owned and maintained by public authorities having jurisdiction in the metropolis. Many others are owned and maintained by extra metropolitan public authorities, and some are of large extent ; 600 acres of Wimbledon-common, for instance, are not included in the table, though continuous with the county area and topographically more metropolitan than Richmond-park, which is one of the Government's contributions, or Epping Forest, which is credited to the City Corporation, and a good deal more than Hainault Forest, which is by far the largest item on the County Council's list. There are also a large number of small places in London maintained by the Metropolitan Public Gardens Association. If all the parks and commons belonging to local authorities in Greater London were added the aggregate would probably be not far short of 20,000 acres. Greater New York, with a population of 4,000,000 or so, has less than 7,000 acres. Taking the list above, however, as it stands, we see that the County Council maintains a smaller acreage than the City Corporation and a smaller number of places than the borough councils. And more than half the County Council area was bequeathed by the Board of Works. The area inherited by the Council, according to its own official reports, was 2,656 acres, that added by it is 2,303 acres. It is a very good record, and I have no intention of decrying it ; but two observations must be made about it. One is that the acquisition of these spaces has been effected with the assistance of numerous agencies ; the other that it has never been a party matter on the Council, but one of general agreement, as is shown by the fact that the Parks Committee is one of the very few committees which have been allowed to have a Moderate chairman. With regard to the first point, some of these spaces have been presented by private persons ; Waterlow-park, for instance, an area of 29 acres in the north of London, which was presented to the Council in its first year. Hainault Forest, which covers more than 800 acres, and therefore represents one-third of the Council's total acquisitions, is a recent addition due to the exertions of Mr. E. N. Buxton,

verderer of Epping Forest ; the Council was only one contributor to the cost out of many, public and private. So, too, with Golder's-hill, another large and recent acquisition ; out of £41,000 the Council contributed £12,000. The list might be continued indefinitely. The fact is that the acquisition of open spaces for the public benefit has been a general movement initiated in most cases by private persons and societies and carried through with help from all quarters—public subscription, individual munificence, Government departments, local authorities, and many other bodies such as the Charity Commissioners, the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, and the City Corporation. It has had nothing to do with politics, it was carried on vigorously years before the County Council was thought of, and the part played by that body has been to contribute to the cost and receive new spaces handed over to its charge as the central metropolitan authority. It looks after them very well, though the regulations are unnecessarily fussy, and spends about £125,000 a year on doing it. The claim of the Progressive party to all the credit, as if parks had never been heard of until their advent on the scene, is ludicrous. The Metropolitan Public Gardens Association, a private society, of which Lord Meath is chairman, has done far more than all the Progressives on this Council, especially for the acquisition of small spaces in poor and crowded neighbourhoods. It has laid out 106 gardens and playgrounds, and contributed to the cost of a great many others, besides planting trees and placing seats in public thoroughfares.

The history of the Fire Brigade is very similar in regard to administration. The Council inherited an institution not only fully grown, but famous ; it has enlarged and improved it and kept it fairly up-to-date ; it has, in short, done its duty. But this, too, has never been a party question ; it is absurd to suppose that any one, belonging to any party, wants an inadequate or incompetent fire brigade, and there is not a shadow of ground for the suggestion that, if the Progressives were turned out of power, the service would suffer. It is alleged on their behalf that the brigade was inadequately equipped when it came under the control of the County Council in 1889, and that they promptly repaired the previous neglect. The facts are that the number of full (horsed) stations in 1889 was 55, and five years later it was still 55 ; the number of steam fire engines in 1889 was 48 and of manual engines 95, and five years later the numbers were still 48 and 95. The only additions to the working equipment in these years were two street stations, two horses, some fire escapes, and 25 hose carts ; so that, if it was inadequate when the Council took over the brigade, it was much more inadequate after five years of control. The fact is it was not inadequate according to the standard then prevailing and the sphere of operations. The staff was no doubt, too small ; Captain

Shaw reported it so, and it was increased during the same period from 674 to 800. Since then there has been a steady increase both of staff and of all appliances, except hose carts and manual engines, which have almost dropped out. The number of hydrants, fire alarms, and telephone lines has been trebled. This increase is perfectly natural; it is due to the growth of London, the extension of the operations of the brigade to outlying areas, the completion of a constant water supply enabling more hydrants to be fixed, the improvement of mechanical apparatus, and the rising standard of fire brigade work in other countries, which is reflected in the demands of the chief executive officer for the time being, who of course wishes his machine to be second to none. The Council has not neglected this service, and that is to its credit; but it has nothing to do with the Progressive policy. The Fire Brigade is not so much as mentioned in "The London Programme," and the greatest improvement introduced with regard to fires is the very useful and efficient salvage corps organized by the insurance companies. If any distinctive influence can be traced at all to the Progressive spirit, it is in the friction generated on several occasions between the Council and the executive by the interference of fussy and self-important members with the discipline and work of the brigade. The Council has changed its chief officer three times; Captain Shaw, who made the brigade and was the most famous of all fire captains, could not work with it; and if the present holder of the post were not a very strong man it would have changed again ere this for the reason given. There is no room for discipline in the guardian-angel theory of administration, and Socialists consider it "degrading"; but a fire brigade cannot be worked without it.

The Parks and the Fire Brigade are the most prominent services which have, happily, been administered on non-party lines; but there are many others of a minor or less public character, and it may be said generally of such duties that they have been performed in an efficient and satisfactory manner. Progressive members are entitled to full credit for these services and to the gratitude of the community for much routine work of a tedious and obscure but necessary kind. It is when their action is governed by party considerations, by the theories and shibboleths derived from Socialism, that extravagance, maladministration, and failure begin to dog their steps. The reason is that those theories spring from a sentimental enthusiasm which despises facts, and are sustained by fallacious arguments, in which inconvenient truths are ignored. The captain of a ship may have the loftiest views on the functions of navigation and the conduct of a ship, but, if his sentiments cause him to ignore the laws of navigation established by experience and to neglect attention to the compass, they will eventually land him and his vessel on the rocks, which are still there though not recognized by his philosophy.

**February 27, 1907.**

## **VIII.**

I come to the subject of Education, the largest of all the duties laid upon the Council; none shows more plainly the unfortunate influence exercised by the long domination of Progressive party politics. Down to 1904 the educational activity of the Council was practically confined to carrying on some "industrial" (reformatory or reclamationary) schools, and to assisting technical institutions and a few secondary schools; it was of a non-contentious, unobtrusive, and useful character, and it attracted little attention. In 1904 the Council became the educational authority for London, and assumed responsibility for all the public schools—elementary, secondary, technical, special, and industrial—except those administered by the Poor Law authorities. This portentous addition to the Council's other duties was the severest test of capacity ever placed upon it. A few statistics will help to demonstrate the magnitude of the undertaking. There were 988 elementary schools, with accommodation for 800,000 children and with 760,000 on the rolls; this represents about one-eighth of the elementary school children in England and Wales; the number of teachers was 17,482. In addition there were 5,839 children in special schools for the blind (271), deaf (576), mentally defective (4,030), and physically defective (962); also 2,134 boys and girls in ten industrial schools; also nearly 100,000 students attending classes in 58 evening schools; also some 60 secondary and 40 technical schools receiving grants and subject to more or less control from the educational authority. How did the Council approach the gigantic task of dealing with all these institutions?

Any body of men, realizing their responsibility, anxious to discharge it conscientiously, and conscious of their own limitations, which are those of human nature, would enter upon such a task in a spirit of diffidence, would aim at mastering by degrees the problems before them, and in doing so would seek all the assistance from experience available; above all, they would be cautious in disturbing the machinery at work and would not attempt large experiments or innovations until they had mastered the details and were quite sure of their ground. That is not the spirit displayed by the Council; it is not the Progressive spirit, which at Spring-gardens is a spirit of prancing self-confidence and self-importance. Responsibility sometimes sobers persons afflicted with that weakness, and there was a chance of recovery for the Progressive Council; but the disease had been too long indulged, and had advanced too far. They failed completely at the test, so completely that they did not even know that it was one. It is only fair to say that they did

not seek it ; but they seek others which would reduce it to comparative insignificance, and their conduct of this unsought duty is a measure of their fitness for the rest. They entered on the business of education in a mood of complacent self-sufficiency which was absolutely fatal to success ; they saw in it primarily another opportunity for demonstrating the wisdom, enlightenment, and superiority of the Progressive party. Swollen with self-importance, they regarded the supremacy of the party, not the needs of education, as the first consideration, and, instead of obtaining as much assistance as possible, they resolved to confine themselves to as little as the law would allow. Their first duty under the Act was to constitute an Education Committee, of which at least a majority was to be appointed by the Council ; and, for the rest, the Act provided for the appointment " of persons of experience in education and of persons acquainted with the needs of the various kinds of schools in the county," for the inclusion of women and the appointment of members of the late School Board. Ample scope was thus given for the formation of a large and widely-representative body, containing members of varied experience. But that is not how the Council construed its duty. The General Purposes Committee—a large committee overwhelmingly Progressive—drew up a report to the effect that the Education Committee " should be one which would work harmoniously with the Council in developing a complete and well-co-ordinated system of London education, and that its constitution should be such as to retain the administration of education under real public control as far as that was possible." This is another way of saying that education should be run on party lines by the Progressives on the Council, and that as few outside members should be appointed as possible. So it was interpreted. The committee was formed of 38 members of the Council—in the proportion of nearly three Progressives to one Moderate—together with five women and five additional members drawn from the old School Board, 48 in all. Thus all the work of the old Board *plus* all the voluntary schools, the secondary and technical schools, was undertaken by a smaller body, most of the members of which were already fully occupied with other municipal duties.

This initial blunder showed that the Council, in its excessive self-confidence, totally failed to realize the magnitude of the task before it. Others, dictated by the same motives, naturally followed. In order to ensure " harmonious working "—otherwise, the supremacy of the party machine—and to prevent any impairment of the Council's importance by even the semblance of a co-ordinate body, the subordinate position of the Education Committee was carefully emphasized by delegating to it as little power as possible, and demonstratively placing it on the same footing as the other committees. One feature of this policy was the withdrawal of the committee's proceedings from publicity

and the exclusion of the Press, which was a little too strong even for the staunchest supporters of the Progressive party. They discovered that their idols were beginning to suffer from the distressing complaint vulgarly known as "swelled head," and protested loudly against this infringement of democratic principles; but it really flowed naturally from the policy consistently pursued and previously applauded by their new critics, who cried out only when the consequences touched themselves. Another feature, which attracted less attention, was the swathing of educational administration in the most complete system of red-tape bondage ever yet devised. The work of the Education Committee requires a number of technical executive officers, who only have to do with schools, and would naturally be under the jurisdiction of the committee, as is the case in similar circumstances everywhere else. But that would make the committee *quasi*-independent and too important; if it had its own staff, it might rival and even overshadow the Council itself, which has always been bitterly jealous of all other metropolitan bodies. That would never do; so the educational officers were to be Council officers attached to the corresponding executive departments of the Council, the schools' medical officer to the health department, the schools' surveyor to the county surveyor's department, the education accountant to the comptroller's department, the education clerk to the chief clerk's office, and so on. In short, the education officers were to be assistants to the other officers, who had nothing to do with the educational work. The effect of this extraordinary scheme was to break up what had been a complete working machine under the School Board, and to distribute the parts over the whole field of the Council's operations. If carried out strictly, it would mean the cumbrous intervention of the Council and the department concerned between the Education Committee and its special officers in every transaction. Every instruction and report would have to go backwards and forwards between committee, Council, and department. The fact that this impossible organization was devised merely in order to keep the Education Committee in its place, so to speak, demonstrates how little the Council was concerned for the efficient administration of education, and how completely subordinate that purpose was to the maintenance of its own importance.

How differently the situation might have been treated may be seen from the example of any of the great provincial towns, which had to solve the same problem and organize a complete scheme of educational administration. Manchester will do as well as any other for an illustration. The number of children on the elementary school roll was about 110,000, or hardly more than one-seventh of the London total; and the other educational departments were in pretty much the same proportions. But the Manchester City Council took its responsibilities seriously, and appointed an

education committee of 57 members, of whom no fewer than 27 were drawn from outside. They took representatives from the University, the secondary schools, the technical schools, the Church of England, Roman Catholic, and Nonconformist elementary schools, from the old School Board, from the teachers, the chamber of commerce, the trades council, the women's trades council, and from elsewhere. They took all the assistance which the law allowed them to obtain ; they invited men of learning and position, men engaged in teaching, men representing all classes and interests and the most varied experience. They availed themselves of the previously existing organization. In short, they took the course best calculated to serve the purpose of efficient administration, without regard to party politics or their own aggrandisement. The Education Committee, thus constituted, is a complete organism, with its own staff ; it works harmoniously with the City Council as a co-ordinate body. It is large enough to attend to all the affairs which it has to administer, and it contains persons who understand them. It works sympathetically with the managers, and treats all its schools and teachers alike. Manchester is merely an example ; the other large towns have all acted broadly in the same way. There is not one which has made such a melancholy exhibition of incapacity as London, because there is not one in which the education authority has been dominated by such unhappy motives.

The failure of the County Council was a foregone conclusion from the manner in which it started. It was warned of what would happen, and what has happened. Experienced men predicted that wasteful and extravagant expenditure must result, that the only permanent element would be the paid official staff, and that the actual power, without representative responsibility, would be in the hands of a bureaucracy. The Council proceeded to fulfil these predictions to the letter. It created an enormous new staff, in which there was no room for the most experienced men who had served the School Board and knew the work best. They were kicked out, not for the sake of economy or efficiency, but because they had experience and formed a link with the past, which was not consistent with the policy of creating an entirely new machine peculiar to the Council. An exception was made of the architect, because his experience might be utilized to harry the voluntary schools, and, since his professional seniority and standing forbade his serving as a subordinate to the Council's architect, he was permitted to retain his old position and have his own department. But, now that he has served the Council's turn, it is proposed to get rid of him too. On the other hand, new and highly-paid posts were created with a lavish extravagance ; the cost of inspection alone rose from £10,000 to £20,000, and that of administration in general from £200,000 to £300,000. On this head it may be as well to quote the most competent witness. The (Progressive)



chairman of the Educational Accounts Sub-Committee said, in a speech on the education estimates delivered in the Council last May :—

One question calling for very serious consideration was the large increase in the cost of administration. In the last year of the School Board this was approximately £200,000, including enforcement of school attendance. It was now approximately £300,000, an increase in four years of 50 per cent. That this was excessive was shown by the fact that the general expenditure on education had increased less than one-half as rapidly. It arose from the multiplication of inspectors, advisers, and other highly-paid officials. . . . So serious did he consider the increasing administrative charges that he advocated the appointment of a special committee to go into the whole question of whether a considerable saving both in time and money could not be effected by the abolition of the dual system of the clerks' and the executive departments. At present the administrative machinery was fearfully and wonderfully made, but extravagantly costly and exceedingly slow in action.

The predictions uttered by experienced critics in 1904 were thus verified to the letter in 1906 from the Progressive benches in the Council. It is admitted on all hands that the educational business is really run by this costly army of officials, organized in the impossible manner described above, and condemned in the quotation just given ; and that the Education Committee has no real control over it. That is the result of the Council's policy ; it would not let the Education Committee do the work, and it cannot do the work itself. The same policy, reaching beyond the committee and the staff, has had the most unfortunate effect on the schools. Instead of co-operating with the managers, the Council has snubbed them, given them as little power as possible, broken up their organization, rearranged it and destroyed their relations with the educational authority ; it has bullied and harassed the voluntary schools, in defiance of election pledges given by Progressive candidates ; it has made the most marked distinction between them and the others, abolished as many as it could, and treated the teachers with contempt ; it has upset the working of all the elementary schools, and degraded the profession. So says the President of the National Union of Teachers, and he puts it down to " the harassing of inspectors, the interference of officials, the unsympathetic attitude of the Education Committee, and, when the cost of living is considered, the comparatively poor salaries paid to teachers." (*The Schoolmaster*, March, 1906.) The responsibility of the Progressive policy for the disorganization of the schools was emphasized by the resignation of Canon Jephson, Progressive member for Walworth, as a

protest against the policy, and in particular against—(1) The destruction of sympathetic management of the schools, and the substitution of mechanical and official control ; (2) the domination of the officials on the Council ; (3) the interference of the Finance Committee in educational matters not bearing on finance. Another Progressive member said in reference to the same complaint (Council meeting May 15, 1906) :—

The plan seemed to be to duplicate the officials in every department. He had never been on the sub-committee where there were not more officials than members present. The additional staff of the clerk of the Council ran away with £56,750. There appeared to be no corresponding increase in the efficiency of the schools as a consequence of this increased expenditure in officials. Indeed, the constant worry had had an unsettling influence on the teaching staff, and Canon Jephson had resigned his seat as a protest against the domination of the officials of the Council. The whole matter required serious consideration, and he thought a special committee should be appointed to inquire into it.

The treatment of the voluntary schools has been most unfair and oppressive, and undisguisedly intended to squeeze them out of existence, although they are carried on at much less cost than the Council schools, and the Council's own inspectors, appointed to survey them, were " without exception much impressed by the teaching given in them " and reported most favourably upon it. When, in November, 1904, the architect presented the first part of his report on the structural requirements of the voluntary schools, it was held back, so that his requirements could not be carried out, in order to wait for the complete report and to present what Mr. McKinnon Wood called " one great picture " of the condition of the schools. The sole undisguised object of this manœuvre was to make a political demonstration against this class of schools.

The secondary schools have been harassed and upset by the same policy as the primary ones. At a meeting of the Incorporated Association of Headmasters, in the Guildhall, on January 11, the headmaster of University College School moved a resolution of protest against the interference of local educational authorities with the administration of secondary schools, and said in the course of his speech :—

The whole administrative policy of the London County Council is apparently based on assumptions most unflattering to governors and to headmasters. It might have been thought that inspection by the Board of Education afforded an adequate guarantee that schools were being efficiently conducted. The fee-paying parent is content to accept such

a guarantee, but the London County Council need further assurance and police the schools with inspectors who make unannounced visits. Now the headmasters of London secondary schools do not need policing. They do not need the advice and suggestions of the inspectors of the London County Council, because they do not recognize the qualification which actual experience of headmastership can alone confer. . . . The right of the headmaster to act as supreme authority in matters of discipline is, apparently, not recognized. Instances are not wanting in which the headmaster has been asked to justify an unfavourable report on a pupil. No headmaster worth his salt will submit the decision of internal affairs to the arbitrament of a chief clerk or executive officer, the point is that he ought not to be asked to do so.

An arrogant, cast-iron bureaucratic tyranny, crushing all zeal, enthusiasm, and interest in those who come under it and who do the real work of teaching, is the system set up by the Progressive party, and the inevitable result of the Progressive policy. The vexatious interference with secondary schools is an integral part of the whole.

The failure is obvious, admitted, undeniable. Things have got into such a mess that some Progressives are now by way of urging the recreation of a School Board. That is tantamount to a complete confession of failure, to which those who have been in charge of affairs naturally do not assent. Nor is there any reason for the step. If the County Council will conduct its educational administration in the same spirit and on the same lines as other great towns, it will succeed equally well. It set out to show the world how to do it, and has succeeded, as persons animated by that spirit usually do, in demonstrating to perfection how not to do it.

What is the cost of this colossal blunder? Briefly, an addition of 4d. to the educational rate in three years. Here are the figures:—1894-5, 10·45d. ; 1903-4, 15·18d. ; 1906-7, 19d. That is to say, while the School Board increased by 5d. in ten years, the Council has increased by 4d. in three years in spite of the advantage of an increased assessment. Yet Progressive candidates are arguing that in ten years they have increased the rates by only 2d., when they have increased the education rate alone by 4d. in three years. That rate is paid by the same ratepayers as the rest. Money has been poured out on this, that, and the other without plan, co-ordination, or control. It must have done something for education, though the good results are not discernible amid the bad ones, and are certainly not commensurate with the expenditure. The average gross cost per child in London County Council schools was, in 1905, £4 15s. 9d., against £2 18s. 7d. in Manchester. Lord Welby has pleaded, as usual, for prudence in at least co-ordinating and graduating schemes ;

he has begged the Council to lay down for its own guidance a financial policy. "Did it," he asked on May 16, 1905, "contemplate no limit on the progress of this expenditure?" Evidently it did not, for on May 8, 1906, he was still urging the Council "at all events to try to practise economy in such matters as expensive sites and decorated buildings." But the only point in which it practises economy is in the treatment of old public servants. It has behaved in a very shabby fashion to several old officers of the School Board; but the case of Captain Seriven, of the Shaftesbury training ship, is a particular example to which I beg to call attention. In 1877—30 years ago—he gave up his commission, with prospects and pension, in the Royal Navy, in which he had served as navigating lieutenant for 19 years, in order to take charge of the Shaftesbury. For 28 years he carried on the school, in which thousands of boys who had got into trouble passed through his hands and were turned into useful citizens. The valuable character of the work, and the admirable manner in which it was performed, repeatedly received official notice. In 1905 the Council decided to close the Shaftesbury, and all they could do for Captain Seriven was to give him six months' notice and "allow him to claim" the pension of £100 a year to which he is entitled from the superannuation fund of the School Board, to which he has himself contributed all these years. Captain Seriven applied for compensation for "abolition of office" under the Education Act, but was refused on the ground of what is virtually a legal quibble. He has appealed to the Treasury, which says that, as the Council has refused to take his claim into consideration, it "has no jurisdiction." So he has been kicked backwards and forwards like a football, and, having served his country for nearly 50 years, and done work of peculiar value to the community for 28, he is to retire into a penurious old age with the consciousness of having done his duty. This is how the Council economizes; and, meantime, it relinquishes £26,000 a year in fees at voluntary schools against the wishes of parents and managers, and spends £300,000 a year on an army of officials, who are to a large extent superfluous, and occupied in disturbing the business of education and disheartening those who carry it on. People who set out to be generous before they are just—a distinguishing mark of Progressivism—invariably end by giving justice the go-by altogether. It only remains to add that the Superannuation (Education) Fund at the disposal of the Council has in hand a balance of £58,000, of which £57,000 is invested.

**February 28, 1907.**

## **IX.**

### **THE TRAMWAYS.**

In connexion with the present contest tramways have been more prominent than any other branch of the County Council's work ; a stranger might almost suppose the election to be a battle of the tramways. This is not due to their intrinsic importance, but to the fact that the Progressive party bases its claims to the confidence of the electors mainly on the results achieved in relation to the tramways, and the other side denies that the alleged results are genuine. The controversy is rather tedious, and the public does not appear to take so much interest in it as the combatants. Nevertheless, it is important for the following reasons. One of the cardinal features of the Progressive policy is the advocacy of municipal trading, and municipal tramways are a form, a mild form, of municipal trading. Now the Socialist axiom, from which the Progressives derive their inspiration, is that municipal trading, which involves collective ownership, is in itself desirable and preferable to private trading and individual ownership, irrespective of results. They assume that the results must be better as an article of faith, needing no proof ; and, if the event falsifies their calculations, they remain just as convinced as before and put down the failure to anything but the theory, which cannot err. The public does not take that view ; it cares nothing about theory, but judges by results. If collective ownership or municipal trading gives better value, then the public is quite willing to accept it, but not otherwise. The first thing, therefore, is to convince the public that a particular project will have very beneficial results, and that expenditure on it will be remunerative. To that end lavish promises are made, just as when some speculator wishes to persuade the public to invest in a doubtful undertaking ; the shyer the public the more lavish the promises. But here comes the difference. If the private speculation fails to realize the promises held forth, the failure cannot be concealed. An adroit financier may stave off exposure for a time, as we know from the law Courts, but eventually he is caught, juggle he never so cleverly. But municipal undertakings have a resource which he has not—the rates ; and the temptation is very strong to improve the apparent results by shifting part of the burden which should be borne by the undertaking on to the rates. This is quite lawful according to the Progressive creed, which sanctifies the means by the end, and holds the cause of collective ownership so sacred as to justify the use of any means to promote it. The net result of this tampering with the truth is not to put money into any one's pockets, except, perhaps, those of some favoured workmen ; it is only to deceive

the public into giving their confidence to persons and their sanction to proceedings from which it would be withheld if they knew the true facts. That is its object, for otherwise such transactions would be purposeless. The real point of the tramway controversy is that the Progressive party is charged with conduct of this kind and with trying to retain the confidence of the ratepayers by putting forward fictitious profits derived from municipal tramways. It is by no means the only case. The practice of "writing down" the value of building sites and charging them to the rates in order to show better results in housing is another instance, which has been discussed in a previous article. An analagous practice, pursued some years ago in the Works Department of cooking the accounts, so as to conceal losses on some items by debiting them to others, caused a crisis in the Council and was generally regarded as a serious scandal, although it did not involve any charge on the rates ; and another method of showing an imaginary profit is alleged against the present Works Department. The tramway case is, therefore, only one of several charges of deceptive finance ; but at the present time it is attracting most attention and is, indeed, peculiarly pertinent in view of the Progressive demand for the municipalization of all the means of locomotion in London. The answer which the public will give to that demand or any part of it, or to any similar demands, whenever put forward, will depend on the previous record. If the past management of similar undertakings has been satisfactory, then the demand for extension will be considered ; if it has been unsatisfactory, the demand will certainly be rejected. In other words, the master will go by the applicant's "character," and a deceptive balance-sheet is nothing less than a false character. Therefore stress is rightly laid on knowing the precise facts. They can be made fairly clear at no great length.

The municipal ownership of tramways was contemplated by Parliament 20 years before the County Council came into existence, and provision was made for it in the Tramways Act of 1870, which empowers the local authority to acquire compulsorily any tramway at the expiry of 21 years from the time when its construction was authorized. It was an extraordinarily foolish Act ; it not only discouraged the development of electrical traction by private enterprise, but made the acquisition of tramways by the local authority an unnecessarily complicated and difficult matter, as the County Council found when the time came to put the Act into operation. The tramway lines, having been constructed at different times, only became purchaseable in disconnected instalments. The first section of about four miles was bought in 1891 and was leased at a rental which brought in 5 per cent. That was in the early days of the Council, before the "London programme" had made its appearance and rational councils still had weight ; the transac-

tion was remunerative. In 1892 other lengths belonging to the North Metropolitan Company became purchasable, but they were not consecutive, and the company refused to sell the whole ; so nothing was done for several years except litigation. Then the practical party (commonly called Moderate) on the Council came to the rescue with a suggestion to settle by agreement, and on this the Tramways Committee was authorized to entertain proposals from the company. The company thereupon made proposals—namely, to sell the whole of the lines and work them on a lease ; and eventually the terms were accepted. It was found on calculation that these terms would be much more profitable than if the Council acquired and worked the trams itself ; and in 1895, when the deal took place, common sense had regained some sway at Spring-gardens through the previous election. The lines were bought and leased, and they brought in about £70,000 a year. The total net profits down to last year were £314,851. The reader will please note here the attitude of the Moderate party to municipal tramways ; so far from opposing they assisted the Council, which had got the thing in a deadlock, to acquire the tramways and to make a very good bargain out of them. The Council thus became the owner of 48 miles of tramways on the north side of the river. Subsequently between 1890 and 1905, it acquired 52 miles on the southern side, and these it has worked itself. The greater part has been electrified and other sections are in process of electrification. The controversy is mainly about this part. The Progressive party is very anxious to show that the lines worked by the Council are highly remunerative undertakings ; their critics deny the claim. It ought to be easy to demonstrate the facts one way or the other ; but the accounts are presented in such a form that it is almost impossible to get a clear result from them, which is in itself suspicious. There is no doubt about the profit from the northern lines, but no human being can say what is the real state of the case with regard to the southern ones. One thing is quite certain ; the promises of vast profits and relief to the rates—casually placed by the Progressive Election Committee in 1901 at “ from one to two millions per annum ” show no signs of being realized. Here is the record for all the Council’s tramways :—

PROFITS FROM TRAMWAYS APPLIED TO RELIEF OF RATES.

1897-98	...	...	£49,000	1902-03	...	...	£20,000
1898-99	...	...	—	1903-04	...	...	
1899-1900	...	...	110,592	1904-05	...	...	
1900-01	...	...	69,000	1905-06	...	...	
1901-02	...	...	45,000	1906-07	...	...	

The figures are differently arranged in other statements, but the total is about the same—namely, £293,000 ; this is less than the net profits from the northern lines alone, and in three of the

years in which profits were applied to the rates the accounts show an excess of expenditure over receipts, so that there were no real profits at all. However it is taken, one can only come to the conclusion that the southern lines have not only earned no profits at all, but have swallowed up a good deal of those made by the northern ones. The southern lines are credited with having earned £87,000 in seven years on a capital expenditure of over £3,000,000, while the northern ones earned £258,000 in the same period on a capital expenditure of £871,000. This is nothing to boast of on behalf of the southern lines ; but, meagre as the result is, it cannot be accepted as valid. The tramway accounts have been " written down," like the housing accounts, by the omission of charges for street widening, for annual depreciation, and for the services of other departments. Usually, when streets have to be widened for the purpose of tramways, the cost is charged against the tramways. That is done in the case of tramway companies in and about London. The Council invented a plan of its own, by which only one-third was to be charged to the tramway, and the rest put upon the rates ; but even this has not been carried out. The Government auditor found (April, 1906) that a total amount of £89,305 had been charged to the tramways account for street widening ; but " the total sum estimated to be chargeable to the tramways account " for street widening was £377,260, and this represented, roughly, one-third of the net cost. Apparently, therefore, street improvements have been undertaken for tramway purposes at a cost of about £1,100,000, of which £90,000 only has been charged against the tramway account. No one will ever know what those tramways have really cost. With regard to depreciation, it is enough to say that on about the same capital expenditure Glasgow allows £200,000 a year for depreciation, the London County Council has recently allowed £35,000. That is the *maximum* ; in some years it has allowed nothing at all. There is not the slightest doubt that if the Council tramways were treated financially as others are they would show a very large annual deficit.

The main reason for this state of things appears to be the excessive cost of electrification, which placed a crushing burden of debt upon the concern ; it has never been explained, but is probably due in part to the Works Department and in part to general extravagance and mismanagement. Lord Welby said (December, 1905) that though he believed " the time would come when the tramways would pay their way " (a tacit admission that they do not yet) " and provide large profits, he could not help saying that the chairman of the Highways Committee was an expensive luxury to London." The failure to pay their way is not due to superior service or superior labour conditions, for they are not superior. Tramway companies working metropolitan lines give services as frequent, fast, cheap, and comfortable as the Council's ; and if their men work longer hours they



receive higher pay. An official return comparing hours and wages on the Council's lines and those of the North Metropolitan Company shows that the Council's drivers and conductors get 37s. 8d. a week for 60 hours ( $7\frac{1}{2}$ d. an hour), the company's men get 41s. 10d. for 70 hours ( $7\frac{1}{4}$ d. an hour); the lower grade men (track cleaners, washers, &c.) not only earn more from the company, but are paid at a higher rate. The mean difference in all grades is only  $\frac{1}{4}$ d. an hour in favour of the Council. An insight into the way the electrification is carried out and into the general conduct of the business is afforded by the ease of the generating station at Greenwich erected to work the south-eastern lines. The reader will remember that the authorities of Greenwich Observatory complained of disturbance and interference with their important work by gases from the chimneys, which are 250ft. high, and by oscillations caused by the engines. The County Council replied by refusing to acknowledge any responsibility, being evidently unaware that their own Act authorizing the station contains a clause expressly providing for this very point and empowering the Board of Trade to make regulations to prevent interference with the Observatory. Eventually the matter was submitted to a Parliamentary committee for inquiry; and it appears from their report recently issued that (a) the engines, which are reciprocating, might perfectly well have been so constructed as to cause no perceptible oscillation of the ground, but no trouble was taken on this point, and the defect cannot now be even partially remedied except at a cost of £10,800; (b) the two chimneys already constructed have been built 33ft. higher than was necessary and they can be reduced at a cost of £1,900, two others which were going to be built to the same unnecessary height can be kept lower. As a complement to these costly blunders it may be added that according to *Electrical Engineering* the generating plant is not up-to-date. If the rest of the undertaking has been carried out with the carelessness and extravagance thus accidentally revealed in a single case, there is no need to look further for an explanation of the financial failure.

The importance of the subject goes far beyond these sordid and tedious details; the whole question of London traffic is bound up with it. Improved means of locomotion are the greatest needs of the metropolis to-day. It is getting them by degrees, mainly through private enterprise. Tramways are one means, a good and useful means in suitable places, but only one out of many. They happen, however, to have been the one means within the power of the Council, and it has gone crazy about them, or rather the Progressive party has. To them tramways are the only means, and they oppose all others. This is a fatal policy. What London wants is every kind of public locomotion, suited to the widely varying conditions in different parts; and it wants them co-ordinated. If the County Council

had shown an open mind, a true regard for public needs, and had conducted its own enterprises with prudence and success, it would have had a strong claim to be entrusted with the task of co-ordination and general control. But with such a record as it has, who can trust it? It has displayed a consistent jealousy and dislike of every improvement but its own tramways; it has declined to co-operate with any other enterprises in the way in which the United Electric Tramways, the new tube, and the District Railway have recently co-operated in a scheme for grouping fares and using through tickets, or even as the tubes and other railways have co-operated by communication between contiguous stations. It opposes the formation of a Traffic Board, as recommended by the Royal Commission. In fact it will allow nothing and nobody to live but itself, and it identifies the public welfare with its own aggrandisement. That is the Progressive policy. "We are the men," they cry, "and wisdom will die with us." And the fruits of wisdom they have to show as masters of locomotion are tramways without profits and steamboats with heavy loss. About the last fiasco little need be said; it is too notorious. Mr. John Burns has recently said that he more than any man is responsible for them, and that he is proud of them. True, no doubt, but not very convincing; for Mr. Burns is proud of everything he does. It must be very pleasant to feel that you have never committed a mistake in your life, and that all your motives are noble and all your actions wise; but somehow results carry more weight with other people. For my part I go by the record. I have no objection to municipal trams or steamboats; on the contrary, I am convinced that both might be made highly successful. But the record of the Progressive Council is one of failure; failure due to incapacity, which generally accompanies abnormal self-esteem. I have paid a good deal of attention to the question of steamboats, and, if it were worth while, could point out the blunders committed under the inspiration of Mr. Burns, which made success impossible. They were pointed out beforehand, but in vain. His pride in them does not make them less or alter the result, which is failure.

#### THE WORKS DEPARTMENT.

A few words must suffice for the other branch of municipal trading undertaken by the Council. The Works Department was established in 1892 for the direct employment of labour and the performance by the Council of its own work. The late Lord Farrer, who was then a member of the Council, pointed out in a memorandum that it had been driven into this course "not only by *a priori* considerations of expediency or by Socialist theories of municipal action, but by its own previous dealings with contractors' wages, which had made it impossible for contractors to tender except at an exorbitant price." Reference has already

been made above to the unhappy result of the experiment, which was carried on in the usual reckless fashion. In 1896, after four years' working, it was discovered by the comptroller (accountant) that a system of falsifying the accounts had been carried on, by which sums which should have been charged to certain works were transferred to others. The object was to make the results appear more favourable than they actually were; those responsible for it had been driven to this device by the failure of the department to answer expectations. They had in fact acted up to the Progressive principle that the end justifies the means, and had practised a little manipulation of figures, by which no one was robbed, to serve the good cause. Naturally this conduct was regarded as rather meritorious than otherwise in certain quarters, and if it had happened more recently the manager would probably have had a rise of salary. But at that time the Progressives were not strong, and the public chose to regard the thing as a scandal; so the manager, poor man, was dismissed and a different system was adopted. Contractors were readmitted by a modification of the labour clauses; the Works Committee was abolished, but the department remained under the financial control of the Finance Committee, and with the manager in the position of contractor to the several committees which wanted work done. In 1902 a Works Committee was again established and has carried on the Works Department ever since. It consists entirely of Progressive members; it had, in 1905, a staff of about 70 and employed between 3,000 and 4,000 men. Its operations appear to grow from year to year, but there is the same difficulty in stating details as in other transactions of the Council. The same accounts appear to be differently stated in different returns. The following table is given in Mr. Holt Schooling's book on "London County Council Finance," which ought to be studied by every London ratepayer:—

Year ended 31st March.	Final estimates.	Actual cost of works.	Actual cost more than final estimates.	Actual cost less than final estimates.
	£	£	£	£
1894-1895 ...	175,733	178,454	2,721	—
1895 ...	207,806	199,189	—	8,617
1897 ...	76,233	85,254	9,021	—
1898 ...	200,174	216,915	16,741	—
1899 ...	154,432	180,043	25,611	—
1900 ...	204,722	224,084	19,362	—
1901 ...	137,072	136,802	—	270
1902 ...	226,778	233,979	7,201	—
1903 ...	695,516	732,631	37,115	—
1904 ...	344,195	312,581	—	31,614
1905 ...	203,147	185,924	—	16,223
1906 ...	603,343	522,936	—	80,377
				137,101
Total ...	3,229,151	3,209,822	117,772	117,772
				19,329

This shows the amount of work executed from year to year and the difference between estimated and actual cost. On the whole period the actual cost is less than the estimated by £19,329 on a total of considerably over three millions. That is no great matter for congratulation ; but it will be observed that there are two series of years, in one of which the actual exceeds the estimated cost almost every year, while in the other series the opposite obtains. The unfavourable results occurred when the Works Department was an open concern under the supervision of the Finance Committee ; the favourable ones since it has been a closed concern under the exclusively Progressive Works Committee. During the last three years the uniformity with which the cost has been brought below the estimates to an aggregate amount of £128,214 is remarkable. This is represented as a " saving " to the ratepayers ; but, of course, the question is not whether the Council has executed works at a less cost than its own estimate, but whether it has executed them at a less cost than contractors would have done. And of that there is no evidence whatever. The claim is a pure assumption, as may be seen if the argument is turned round and a saving claimed whenever a contractor's tender is less than the estimate, which has often happened. In fact this sort of " saving " far exceeds that of the Works Department. In 1904, for instance, tenders were accepted for the following large sums below the estimate—in one case £122,563, in another £34,490, in a third £10,442, and a fourth £29,227. These and many others ought to be classed as " savings " effected by the contract system. It is evident that until the transactions of the Works Department are controlled by open competition with contractors no one can say what the results really are. To claim success for it as it stands is merely humbugging the public. Its disadvantages as a political machine employing thousands of men who look to certain Progressive members as their patrons are obvious ; a situation more likely to lead to corruption cannot be imagined.



**March 4, 1907.**

## THE ELECTION.

The triennial election of 118 councillors for the 58 constituencies representing the London County Council took place on Saturday, March 2, 1907, and resulted in an overwhelming victory for the Municipal Reformers. Since the formation of the Council 18 years ago this is the first time such a result has been achieved.

The outgoing Council, when elected in 1904, consisted of 83 Progressives, 34 Moderates, and one Independent. Several by-elections have taken place, but they have not altered the balance of parties, except in the case of Fulham, where a Moderate was elected in the place of a Progressive. The position has now been almost reversed, as the new Council will consist of 79 Municipal Reformers, 38 Progressives, and one Independent. This is exclusive of the nine aldermen who are to be elected by the Council and will in due time add to the Reformers' forces.

Previous Councils having been elected by a minority of voters, mainly through apathy and indifference, strong appeals were made on both sides that voters should exercise their franchise, and the result has been a large increase in the total voting. Nearly half a million persons went to the poll, and as each had two votes, and in the City four, the result was that the Municipal Reformers received roughly about 527,000 votes, the Progressives 392,000, the Socialists just over 4,500, and the Independents 4,900. The total number of persons registered as entitled to vote was 840,730, but this included plural registrations, the number of which it is impossible to state. The average of persons voting exceeded 52 per cent., and in some cases more than 70 per cent. went to the poll (Battersea, for instance, was 72 per cent.). All the outlying divisions, without an exception, such as Hampstead, North Islington, and North Hackney in the north, Hammersmith, Chelsea, Fulham, Paddington, Kensington, and Marylebone in the west, Dulwich, Wandsworth, Clapham, Brixton, Norwood, and Lewisham in the south, and Bow and Bromley in the east, went solid for the Municipal Reformers. In all these constituencies the middle class vote told heavily against the Progressives. The industrial divisions of Greenwich and Woolwich went the same way, whilst their sister division Deptford was retained by Mr. Sidney Webb and his Progressive colleague by narrow majorities.

The feature of the election was the higher vote recorded for the Municipal Reformers in nearly every division. Such strong Moderate strongholds as the City of London, Holborn, St. George's, Hanover-square, South Kensington, the Strand, Westminster, and Wandsworth showed greatly increased majorities, while the Progressive strongholds such as Newington, Walworth, the two divisions of Bethnal-green, South Hackney, Kennington,

Poplar, Rotherhithe, and West Southwark were kept intact by substantially decreased majorities. The highest individual vote by a Municipal Reformer was in Wandsworth, with a total of 15,700, and the highest Progressive winner was in Battersea, with 7,250. Mr. Burns's seat in Battersea has been filled by a Municipal Reformer, and the late leader of the Progressive party, Mr. McKinnon Wood, who retired owing to his Parliamentary duties, has been succeeded in Central Hackney by a Municipal Reformer. Among the Progressives who were beaten were Lord Monkswell at Haggerston, the Hon. Neil Primrose in Lewisham, Lord Craven in St. George's, Hanover-square, and the following members of Parliament:—Mr. Cleland in Lewisham, Mr. W. H. Dickinson in the City, Mr. G. A. Hardy in Dulwich, and Mr. Horniman in Chelsea.

On the whole, the Municipal Reformers won 46 seats and lost two, making a net gain of 44 seats. The Socialists, running avowedly as such, fared very badly, receiving comparatively little support, and the Independent Labour party did no better. The Progressives declare that their defeat is due to a combination of adverse circumstances, and that their opponents are the tools of some great trust; on the other hand, the Municipal Reformers state that their victory has been brought about by the revolt of the tradesman and middle class against municipal trading and Socialism, and that their wins in the East-end and elsewhere prove that the working classes have assisted in bringing about this consummation.

The following are the figures of Saturday's election. The party connexion of the candidates is indicated thus—(M.R.) Municipal Reformer, (P.) Progressive, (I.) Independent, (S.) Socialist, (S.D.) Social Democrat, (L.) Labour, (P. and L.) Progressive and Labour, (R.C.) Roman Catholic. An asterisk indicates a member of the outgoing Council:—

BATTERSEA AND CLAPHAM (BATTERSEA) (22,911 Electors).			
*Mr. W. DAVIES (P.)...	7,250	Mr. W. H. Humphreys (S.)....	489
Mr. A. SHIRLEY BENN (M.R.)	7,217	Mr. J. Fitzgerald (S.)	98
Mr. E. Evans (M.R.)	6,691	Mr. H. Jansen-Neumann (S.)	42
Mr. J. West (P.)	6,669		

One M.R. gain. Majority, 526.

At the last election, in 1901, the figures were:—Mr. J. Burns, M.P. (P.), 5,513; Mr. W. Davies (P.), 5,502; Mr. F. D. Thomas (C. and U.), 2,503. The division in the previous elections was represented by Progressives.

BATTERSEA AND CLAPHAM (CLAPHAM) (28,076).			
Mr. T. W. DOMONEY (M.R.)	10,200	Mr. A. Glegg (P.)	7,320
SIR C. KINLOCH-COOKE (M.R.)	10,158	Mr. J. G. Kipling (P.)	7,276
No change. Majority, 2,880.			

In 1901 the figures were:—Lieutenant-Colonel Rotton (C. and U.), 5,910; Mr. T. Penn Gaskell (C. and U.), 5,761; Mr. J. G. Kipling (P.), 5,511; Mr. E. C. Pannett (P.), 5,108. At the previous elections the division returned Moderates, except in 1892, when it was represented by two Progressives.

## BETHNAL-GREEN (NORTH-EAST) (11,027).

*STR. E. CORNWALL, M.P. (P.)	3,877	Mr. R. A. Robinson (M.R.)	...	1,918		
*MR. E. SMITH (P.)	...	...	3,776	Mr. L. H. Lemon (M.R.)	...	1,907
No change. Majority, 1,959.						

In 1901 the figures were :—Mr. E. Smith (P.), 3,265 ; Mr. E. A. Cornwall (P.), 3,251 ; Dr. McCrae (C. and U.), 1,211 ; Mr. Storry Deans (C. and U.) 1,163.

## BETHNAL-GREEN (SOUTH-WEST) (9,708).

REV. STEWART HEADLAM (P.)	2,995	Mr. F. Brinsley-Harper		
Mr. PERCY A. HARRIS (P.)	2,762	(M.R.)	...	1,643
Mr. F. Sebag-Montefiore		Mr. J. H. Harley (L.)	...	512
(M.R.)	...	...	1,774	
No change. Majority, 1,224.				

In 1901 the figures were :—Mr. J. Branch (P.), 2,490 ; Mr. T. Wiles (P.), 2,458 ; Mr. J. H. Keeling (M.), 955 ; Mr. A. Maconachie (M.), 955. The division returned Progressives in the previous elections.

## CAMBERWELL (DULWICH) (16,861).

Mr. H. C. GOOCH (M.R.)	...	6,689	*Mr. G. A. Hardy, M.P. (P.)	5,020	
Mr. F. HALL (M.R.)	...	6,641	Mr. A. Cohn (P.)	...	4,810
Two M.R. gains.		Majority, 1,669.			

In 1904 the figures were :—Mr. G. A. Hardy (P.), 4,347 ; Mr. T. Gautrey (P.), 4,275 ; Mr. W. L. Mitchell (M.), 3,548 ; Mr. H. C. Gooch (M.), 3,531. In 1901 the representation was divided, and in all the other elections Moderates were returned.

## CAMBERWELL (NORTH) (18,201).

*MR. R. BRAY (P.)	...	5,419	Mr. A. Campbell (M.R.)	...	3,545
*MR. H. R. TAYLOR (P.)	...	5,365	Mr. W. Edmonds (M.R.)	...	3,472
No change. Majority, 1,904.					

In 1901 the figures were :—Mr. H. R. Taylor (P.), 3,670 ; Mr. R. Bray (P.), 3,563 ; Mr. T. C. L. Miller (L.), 1,229. At previous elections the division returned Progressives.

## CAMBERWELL (PECKHAM) (18,538).

*MR. T. GAUTREY (P.)	...	4,659	Mr. R. Steven (P.)	...	4,262
Mr. W. L. DOWNTON (M.R.)	4,426	Mr. W. T. Kelly (L.)	...	199	
Mr. D. C. Preston (M.R.)	4,379				
One M.R. gain. Majority, 161.					

In 1901 the figures were :—Mr. C. G. Clarke (P.), 3,935 ; Mr. F. W. Verney (P.), 3,871 ; Mr. J. Somerville (M.), 1,759 ; Sir F. Fleming, 1,666. At the previous elections the division returned Progressives.

## CHELSEA (16,802).

Mr. T. C. E. GOFF (M.R.)	...	5,877	*Mr. J. Jeffery (P.)	...	3,915
Mr. R. C. NORMAN (M.R.)	...	5,779			
*Mr. E. J. Horniman,					
M.P. (P.)	...	3,977			
Two M.R. gains. Majority, 1,900.					

In 1901 the figures were :—Mr. J. Jeffery (P.), 4,221 ; Mr. E. J. Horniman (P.), 4,143 ; Major-General Sartorius (M.), 3,471 ; Mr. C. Goff (M.), 3,462. In 1901 and 1898 two Progressives were returned, in 1895 the representation was divided, and in the other elections two Progressives were elected.

## CITY OF LONDON (25,784).

Mr. ALDERMAN HANSON (M.R.) ... ..	7,603	Mr. C. R. Buxton (P.) ...	1,768
Mr. N. L. COHEN (M.R.) ...	7,519	Mr. F. Debenham (P.) ...	1,766
Mr. W. H. PANNELL (M.R.)...	7,484	Mr. G. S. Warmington (P.) ...	1,719
*Mr. H. STUART SANKEY (M.R.) ... ..	7,451	*Mr. W. H. Dickinson, M.P. (P.) ... ..	1,646

No change. Majority, 5,835.

In 1904 the figures were :—Mr. Alderman Alliston (M.), 4,907 ; Sir T. Brooke-Hitching (M.), 4,858 ; the Hon. R. Guinness (M.), 4,799 ; Mr. H. S. Sankey (M.), 4,606 ; Mr. F. W. Buxton (P.), 2,342 ; Lord Sandhurst (P.), 2,298. Mr. Dickinson was an Alderman in the last Council.

## DEPTFORD (21,549).

*Mr. SIDNEY WEBB (P.) ...	6,185	Mr. W. F. Barrett (M.R.) ...	5,899
*Mr. R. C. PHILLIMORE (P.)	6,083	Mr. R. R. Fairbairn (L.) ...	182
Mr. H. G. Wells (M.R.)	5,979		

No change. Majority, 206.

In 1904 Mr. Webb and Mr. Phillimore were returned unopposed. In 1901, 1898, and 1892 two Progressives were elected, and in 1895 and 1889 one Moderate and one Progressive.

## FINSBURY (CENTRAL) (9,733).

*CAPT. THE HON. F. HEMP- HILL (P.) ... ..	2,806	*Capt. G. S. C. Swinton (M.R.) ... ..	2,508
*Mr. A. B. RUSSELL (P.) ...	2,791	Mr. M. Chapman (M.R.) ...	2,507

No change. Majority, 283.

In 1901 the figures were :—Capt. F. Hemphill (P.), 2,361 ; Mr. A. B. Russell (P.), 2,338 ; the Rev. R. F. Hosken (M.), 1,935 ; Mr. F. H. M. Wayne (M.), 1,914. In 1901 two Progressives were elected, in 1898 two Moderates, and at the three previous elections two Progressives. Captain Swinton represented Holborn in the last Council.

## FINSBURY (EAST) (6,687).

COL. A. C. WELBY (M.R.) ...	2,024	*Mr. T. E. Harvey (P.) ...	1,988
Mr. E. HOWES (M.R.) ...	2,014	Mr. F. A. Harrison (P.) ...	1,988

Two M.R. gains. Majority, 36.

In 1901 the figures were :—Mr. J. A. Baker (P.), 2,336 ; Mr. T. E. Harvey (P.), 2,190 ; Mr. E. Howes (M.), 1,772 ; Mr. W. Smith (M.), 1,618. At the previous elections two Progressives were returned.

## FINSBURY (HOLBORN) (12,396).

Mr. E. E. WILD (M.R.) ...	1,524	Mr. H. Drysdale Woodcock (P.) ... ..	1,629
HON. H. LYGON (M.R.) ...	1,030		

No change. Majority, 2,895.

In 1901 the figures were :—Sir H. W. Bliss (M.), 2,670 ; Capt. Swinton (M.), 2,619 ; Mr. W. H. Ansell (P.), 1,241 ; Mr. A. Goodes (P.), 1,169. At all the previous elections Moderates were elected, except in 1889, when the representation was divided.

## FULHAM (26,409).

*Mr. C. COBB (M.R.)... ..	8,413	Mr. J. Stephenson (L.) ...	3,139
Mr. E. G. EASTON (M.R.) ...	8,301	Mr. T. R. Wall (S.D.) ...	773
Mr. W. Lloyd Taylor (P.)	4,774		

One M.R. gain. Majority, 3,639.

In 1901 the numbers were :—Mr. P. Lawson (P.), 6,207 ; Mr. T. Davies (P.), 6,179 ; Major Skinner (M.), 5,217 ; Lord Lytton (M.), 5,157. At the previous elections Progressives were returned in 1901, 1895, and 1892 ; in 1898 two Moderates were elected, and in 1889 one of each party.



## GREENWICH (15,987).

Mr. I. H. BENN (M.R.)	... 6,217	Mr. D. McCall (P.)	... 3,727
LORD ALEXANDER THYNNE (M.R.)	... 5,991	Rev. J. Wilson (P.)	... 3,515

Two M.R. gains. Majority, 2,490.

In 1904 the figures were :—Mr. R. S. Jackson (P.) and Mr. F. W. Warmington (P.) unopposed. The division has elected Progressives at every previous election except in 1895, when two Moderates were returned.

## HACKNEY (CENTRAL) (12,809).

Mr. W. B. STEWART (M.R.)	3,722	*Mr. A. J. Shephard (P.)	... 3,558
Mr. G. BILLINGS (M.R.)	... 3,659	Mr. E. C. Fairchild (S.D.)	... 296
*Mr. W. B. Yates (P.)	... 3,559	Mr. F. V. Fisher (S.D.)	... 257

Two M.R. gains. Majority, 163.

In 1904 the figures were :—Mr. T. McKinnon Wood (P.), 3,534 ; Mr. A. J. Shephard (P.), 3,476 ; Lord Bingham (M.), 2,120 ; Mr. G. Cartwright (M.), 2,097. With the exception of the 1889 election, when two Moderates were returned, the division has always elected Progressives.

## HACKNEY (NORTH) (16,990).

Mr. W. H. KEY (M.R.)	... 6,205	*Mr. G. Lampard (P.)	... 4,617
Mr. R. GREENE (M.R.)	... 6,153	Mr. Price (P.)	... 1,530

Two M.R. gains. Majority, 1,588.

In 1904 the numbers were :—Mr. G. Lampard (P.), 4,372 ; Mr. J. E. Sears (P.), 4,189 ; Mr. F. M. Miller (M.), 3,973 ; Mr. W. H. Key (M.), 3,942. In 1901 two Progressives were elected, in 1898 one Moderate and one Progressive, in 1895 two Moderates, and in 1892 and 1889 one of each party.

## HACKNEY (SOUTH) (18,114).

Mr. T. CHAPMAN (P.)	... 5,225	Mr. C. Winkley (M.R.)	... 3,325
Mr. W. A. CASSON (P.)	... 5,138	Mr. G. Naylor (M.R.)	... 3,285

No change. Majority, 1,900.

In 1904 the figures were :—Mr. E. Browne (P.), 4,318 ; Mr. A. Smith (P.), 4,316 ; Mr. S. Boulter (M.), 1,776 ; Lieutenant-Colonel Craig (M.), 1,767. The division returned Progressives at all the previous elections.

## HAMMERSMITH (17,949).

*Mr. J. BRANDON (M.R.)	... 5,850	Mr. L. E. Camp (P.)	... 2,709
*Mr. E. COLLINS (M.R.)	... 5,839	Dr. W. T. Davidson (L.)	... 897
Mr. N. Shaip (P.)	... 2,755	Mr. J. T. Westcott (L.)	... 737

No change. Majority, 3,095.

In 1904 the figures were :—Mr. J. Brandon (M.), 3,501 ; Mr. E. Collins (M.), 3,494 ; Mr. J. G. Ritchie (P.), 3,483 ; Mr. F. Whelen (P.), 3,392. The division has always returned Moderates.

## HAMPSTEAD (15,012).

*Mr. J. T. TAYLOR (M.R.)	... 5,577	Mr. G. L. Bruce (P.)	... 2,894
Mr. W. REYNOLDS (M.R.)	... 5,508	Mr. C. A. McCurdy (P.)	... 2,878

No change. Majority, 2,683.

In 1904 the figures were :—Mr. N. Hanhart (M.), 3,252 ; Mr. J. T. Taylor (M.), 3,213 ; Mr. W. E. Mullins (P.), 2,893 ; Mr. C. H. Smith (P.), 2,737. In 1901 the division elected one of each party, and at the previous elections Moderates were returned.

## ISLINGTON (EAST) (15,591).

Mr. C. A. M. BARLOW (M.R.)	4,430	Mr. E. Smallwood (P.)	... 4,292
Mr. P. E. PILDITCH (M.R.)	4,402	*Mr. A. A. Thomas (P.)	... 4,257

Two M.R. gains. Majority, 138.

In 1904 the figures were :—Mr. A. M. Torrance (P.), 4,413 ; Mr. A. A. Thomas (P.), 3,914 ; Mr. A. H. Caesar (M.), 2,416. At the previous elections the division elected Progressives except in 1889, when one Progressive and one Moderate were returned.

## ISLINGTON (NORTH) (16,977).

Mr. F. L. DOVE (M.R.)	... 4,924	Mr. H. G. Chancellor (P.)	4,192
Mr. C. K. MURCHISON (M.R.)	4,797	Mr. J. C. Clutterbuck (I.)	... 364

Mr. H. J. Glanville (P.) 4,200

Two M.R. gains. Majority, 724.

In 1904 the figures were :—Dr. T. B. Napier (P.), 3,876 ; Mr. W. C. Parkinson (P.), 3,858 ; Alderman Tomkins (M.), 2,811 ; Mr. J. W. Sharp (M.), 2,771. At all the previous elections the Progressives were successful.

## ISLINGTON (SOUTH) (11,602).

*Mr. G. DEW (L.)	... 2,996	Mr. C. Moffatt (M.R.)	... 2,076
*Mr. HOWELL J. WILLIAMS (P.)	... 2,929	Mr. G. S. Elliott (I.)	... 854
Mr. S. Lambert (M.R.)	... 2,217	Mr. E. J. James (I.)	... 179

No change. Majority, 779.

In 1904 the numbers were :—Mr. H. J. Williams (P.), 2,536 ; Mr. G. Dew (L.), 2,437 ; Mr. G. S. Elliott (I.), 1,770 ; Mr. S. Lambert (I.), 1,526 ; Mr. A. Memory (I.P.), 356. In 1901 a Progressive and a Moderate (Mr. G. S. Elliott) were elected ; in 1898 a Progressive and an Independent Progressive (Mr. G. S. Elliott), and at the previous three elections two Progressives.

## ISLINGTON (WEST) (10,142).

Mr. H. J. CLARKE (M.R.)	... 3,300	Mr. R. C. Lambert (P.)	... 2,933
Mr. J. SALMON (M.R.)	... 3,226	Mr. A. J. Mundella (P.)	... 2,900

Two M.R. gains. Majority, 367.

In 1904 the numbers were :—Mr. W. Goodman (P.), 2,901 ; Mr. G. H. Radford (P.), 2,874 ; Mr. A. J. Adams (M.), 1,705 ; Mr. H. J. Clarke (M.), 1,695. In 1901, 1898, and 1895 two Progressives were returned, and at the previous elections one of each party.

## KENSINGTON (NORTH) (11,770).

Mr. D. DAVIS (M.R.)	... 4,118	*Mr. H. L. Jephson (P.)	... 3,181
MAJOR C. L. A. SKINNER (M.R.)	... 4,382	*Mr. W. Pope (P.)	... 3,170

Two M.R. gains. Majority, 1,237.

In 1901 the numbers were :—Mr. W. Pope (P.), 3,232 ; Mr. H. L. Jephson (P.), 3,203 ; Mr. W. W. Thompson (M.), 2,911 ; Baron Percy de Worms (M.), 2,858. In 1901 two Progressives were elected ; in 1898 and 1895 two Moderates, and at the previous elections two Progressives.

## KENSINGTON (SOUTH) (11,539).

*Mr. R. A. ROBINSON (M.R.)	5,869	Mr. V. R. Aronson (P.)	... 788
*Dr. E. B. FORMAN (Alderman) (M.R.)	... 5,834	The Hon. W. James (P.)	... 770

No change. Majority, 5,081.

In 1904 the numbers were :—Mr. R. A. Robinson (M.), 3,538 ; the Hon. F. J. N. Thesiger (M.), 3,519 ; Mr. P. Carr (P.), 682 ; Mr. H. J. Norton (P.), 660. The division returned Moderates at all the previous elections.

## LAMBETH (BRINGTON) (13,921).

Mr. W. HAYDON (M.R.) ...	4,997	*Mr. L. Sharp (P.) ...	3,546
Mr. S. G. HOARE (M.R.) ...	4,928	Mr. L. Earle, C.M.G. (P.) ...	3,525

Two M.R. gains. Majority, 1,451.

In 1904 the numbers were :—Mr. F. Dolman (P.), 3,170 ; Mr. L. Sharp (P.), 3,120 ; Mr. W. Haydon (M.), 2,922 ; Mr. S. Cresswell (M.), 2,911. In 1901 two Progressives were elected, in 1898 and 1895 two Moderates, and in the two previous elections two Progressives.

## LAMBETH (KENNINGTON) (11,842).

*SIR J. W. BENN, M.P. (P.)...	3,424	Sir W. Porter (M.R.) ...	2,666
THE REV. E. DENNY (P.) ...	3,326	Mr. J. G. Butler (S.D.) ...	281
Mr. J. F. Budge (M.R.) ...	2,718	Mr. Knee (S.D.) ...	235

No change. Majority, 706.

In 1904 the numbers were :—Mr. S. Collins (P.), 3,394 ; Mr. J. W. Benn (P.), 3,388 ; Canon Allen Edwards (M.), 2,160. At the previous elections two Progressives were returned, except in 1895 and 1889, when the representation was divided.

## LAMBETH (NORTH) (8,237).

*Mr. F. BRIANT (P.)...	2,360	*Mr. Jabez Williams (M.R.)...	2,080
Mr. F. SMITH (P.) ...	2,249	Mr. G. Hinds (M.R.)...	2,077

One P. gain. Majority, 280.

In 1904 the numbers were :—Mr. W. Wightman (P.), 1,180 ; Mr. J. Williams (M.), 1,152 ; Mr. A. Brooks (M.), 1,103 ; Mr. J. G. Gregory (P.), 1,028 ; Mr. W. E. Clery (I.P.), 422 ; Mr. J. Clark (I.P.), 419 ; Mr. W. H. Lock (I.P.), 265. At all the previous elections Progressives were returned, except in 1899, when two Moderates were chosen.

## LAMBETH (NORWOOD) (16,278).

Mr. C. U. FISHER (M.R.) ...	6,585	*Mr. N. W. Hubbard (P.) ...	4,174
Mr. F. ST. JOHN MORROW (M.R.) ...	6,539	*Mr. G. Shrubbsall (P.) ...	4,120

Two M.R. gains. Majority, 2,411.

In 1904 the numbers were :—Mr. N. W. Hubbard (P.), 4,328 ; Mr. G. Shrubbsall (P.), 4,223 ; Mr. E. Micholls (M.), 3,922 ; Mr. A. Chapman (M.), 3,887. At the previous elections Progressives were returned, except in 1898 and 1895, when Moderates were elected.

## LEWISHAM (28,217).

LORD LEWISHAM (M.R.) ...	11,028	The Hon. Neil Primrose (P.)...	6,893
Mr. A. POWNALL (M.R.) ...	10,818	Mr. Gee (L.) ...	118

\*Mr. J. W. Cleland, M.P. (P.) 7,001

Two M.R. gains. Majority, 1,021.

The numbers in 1904 were :—\*Mr. J. W. Cleland (P.), 6,297 ; the Hon. A. Lyulph Stanley (P.), 5,946 ; Mr. J. Vesey Fitzgerald, K.C. (M.), 1,557 ; Mr. E. L. Hartley (M.), 1,446. In 1901 the representation was divided ; in 1898 and 1895 two Moderates were returned, and 1892 and 1889 one Moderate and one Progressive.

## MARYLEBONE (EAST) (9,111).

LORD DUNCANSON (M.R.) ...	3,612	Dr. J. F. Little (P.)...	1,446
Mr. J. BOYTON (M.R.) ...	3,562	Mr. F. Gill (P.) ...	467

No change. Majority, 1,166.

In 1904 the numbers were :—Lord Ludlow (M.), 2,848 ; Mr. W. C. Bridgeman (M.), 2,779 ; Dr. J. F. Little (P.), 1,762 ; Dr. W. Leaf (P.), 1,747. At the 1901 election Dr. Little and Dr. Leaf were returned as Independents. At each of the previous elections Moderates were elected.

## MARYLEBONE (WEST) (12,255).

LORD HENRY BENTINCK	*Mr. J. Lewis (P.)	...	...	2,434
(M.R.) ...	4,683	Dr. J. Searson (P.)	...	2,320
LORD KERRY (M.R.)	...	4,625		

One M.R. gain. Majority, 2,249.

In 1904 the numbers were :—Mr. J. Lewis (P.), 2,708 ; Mr. W. Bailey (M.), 2,509 ; Mr. E. White (M.), 2,450 ; Mr. W. H. Sands (P.), 2,422. At all the previous elections the division returned two Moderates.

## NEWINGTON (WALWORTH) (11,046).

*Mr. J. A. DAWES (P.)	...	2,823	Mr. C. Sproule (M.R.)	...	2,235
*Mr. C. JESSON (P.)	...	2,819	Mr. J. Clarke (S.)	...	187
Dr. F. Oldfield (M.R.)	...	2,337			

No change. Majority, 486.

In 1904 the numbers were :—Mr. R. Spokes (P.), 2,484 ; the Rev. A. W. Jephson (P.), 2,425 ; Mr. J. Youldon (M.), 1,754 ; Mr. F. J. P. Smith (M.), 1,641. At each of the previous elections two Progressives were returned.

## NEWINGTON (WEST) (12,483).

*Mr. EVAN SPICER (Alder-	Mr. A. Waddell (M.R.)	...	2,705
man) (P.)	...	...	3,778
*Mr. J. D. GILBERT (P.)	...	Mr. H. Jarvis (M.R.)...	...
	...		2,700
	...		3,759

No change. Majority, 1,073.

In 1904 the numbers were :—Mr. J. Piggott (P.), 3,244 ; Mr. J. D. Gilbert (P.), 3,029 ; Mr. W. Lansdale (M.), 1,380 ; Major C. Gibbings (M.), 1,356. At each of the previous elections the division returned two Progressives.

## PADDINGTON (NORTH) (15,664).

THE HON. W. GUINNESS (M.R.)	4,711	Mr. J. Fairbanks (P.)...	... 3,607
Mr. J. H. HUNTER (M.R.)	... 4,597	Mr. G. C. Maberly (P.)	... 3,453

No change. Majority, 1,104.

In 1904 the numbers were :—Sir R. M. Beachcroft (M.), 3,346 ; Mr. J. Stevens (M.), 3,120 ; Mr. J. Blackwood (P.), 2,393 ; Mr. G. H. Turner (P.), 2,172. At the 1901 election the representation was divided, and at each of the previous contests two Moderates were returned.

## PADDINGTON (SOUTH) (9,582).

*SIR R. M. BEACHCROFT	Mr. J. S. Holmes (P.)	...	848
(M.R.) ... .. 3,763	Mr. A. Y. Mayell (P.)	...	816
*MR. H. P. HARRIS (M.R.)... 3,709			

No change. Majority, 2,915.

In 1904 the figures were :—Mr. H. A. Harben (M.), 2,608 ; Mr. H. P. Harris (M.), 2,589 ; Mr. J. Kennedy (P.), 970 ; Mr. D. Vaughan Owen (P.), 937. At each of the previous elections the division returned two Moderates.

## ST. GEORGE'S, HANOVER-SQUARE (13,477).

LORD CHEYLESMORE (M.R.)	5,445	Lord Craven (P.)	...	1,384
*Mr. H. J. GREENWOOD (M.R.)	5,375	Mr. T. E. Morris (P.)	...	1,348

No change. Majority, 4,061.

In 1901 the numbers were :—Mr. H. J. Greenwood (M.), 3,144 ; the Hon. F. D. Leigh (M.), 3,113 ; Lord O'Hagan (P.), 1,911 ; Mr. R. G. Webster (P.), 1,852 ; Mr. S. Copp (L.), 87. In each of the previous elections the division returned two Moderates.

## ST. PANCRAS (EAST) (12,470).

Mr. A. W. CLAREMONT (P.)	3,482	Mr. T. A. Organ (M.R.)	... 3,005
The Rev. F. HASTINGS (P.)	3,410	Mr. G. Horne (S.)	... 295
*Mr. E. Barnes (M.R.)	... 3,181		

One P. gain. Majority, 301.

In 1904 the numbers were :—Mr. T. H. W. Idris (P.), 2,751 ; Mr. E. Barnes (M.), 2,731 ; Mr. D. Hennessy (P.), 2,558. At the 1901 and the 1898 elections Progressives were returned, and at each of the previous elections the representation was divided.

## ST. PANCRAS (NORTH) (12,162).

*Mr. D. S. WATERLOW, M.P.		Mr. E. J. King (M.R.)	... 3,526
(P.)	... 3,847	Lieut.-Col. Pakenham (M.R.)	3,501
*Dr. R. M. BEATON (P.)	... 3,824		

No change. Majority 321.

In 1904 the numbers were :—Mr. R. M. Beaton, M.B. (P.), 3,045 ; Mr. D. S. Waterlow (P.), 3,023 ; Mr. W. Low (M.), 1,737 ; Mr. H. B. Betterton (M.), 1,695. In 1901 and 1898 two Progressives were returned, in 1895 and 1892 the representation was divided, and in 1889 two Progressives were elected.

## ST. PANCRAS (SOUTH) (7,972).

Mr. GEORGE ALEXANDER		The Rev. Silvester Horne (P.)	1,613
(M.R.)	... 2,963	Mr. G. Giddens (P.)	... 1,583
*Mr. F. GOLDSMITH (M.R.)	2,897		

No change. Majority, 1,350.

In 1904 the numbers were :—Major H. Gastrell (M.), 1,927 ; Mr. F. Goldsmith (M.), 1,808 ; Mr. Bernard Shaw (P.), 1,460 ; Sir W. N. Geary (P.), 1,412. In 1901 two Progressives were returned, in 1898 and 1895 one Progressive and one Moderate, in 1892 two Progressives, and in 1889 one Progressive and one Moderate.

## ST. PANCRAS (WEST) (10,943).

Mr. P. VOSPER (M.R.)	... 3,504	Mr. H. Cohen (P.)	... 2,461
Mr. F. CASSEL, K.C. (M.R.)	3,471	Mr. J. C. S. Hanham (P.)	... 2,442

Two M.R. gains. Majority, 1,043.

In 1904 the numbers were :—Sir W. J. Collins (P.), 2,889 ; Lord Carrington (P.), 2,769 ; Mr. A. F. Buxton (M.), 1,352 ; Dr. W. Smith (M.), 1,341 ; Mr. G. H. Baker, 125. At each of the previous elections two Progressives were returned, except the first, when the representation was divided.

## SHOREDITCH (HAGGERSTON) (10,933).

*THE HON. RUPERT GUINNESS		*Lord Monkswell (P.)	... 3,085
(M.R.)	... 3,307	Mr. Stephen Gee (P.)	... 3,026
THE HON. G. JOHNSTONE			
(M.R.)	... 3,131		

Two M.R. gains. Majority, 222.

In 1901 the figures were :—Lord Monkswell (P.), 2,479 ; Mr. J. Stuart (P.), 2,456 ; Major Stokoe (M.), 1,093 ; Mr. J. H. S. Lloyd (M.), 1,030. At each of the previous elections two Progressives were returned.

## SHOREDITCH (HÖXTON) (12,019).

Dr. J. DAVIES (M.R.)	... 3,272	*Mr. H. Ward (P.)	... 3,112
Mr. E. GRAY (M.R.)	... 3,226	*Mr. Graham Wallas (P.)	... 3,065

Two M.R. gains. Majority, 160.

In 1901 the numbers were :—Mr. H. Ward (P.), 2,436 ; Mr. Graham Wallas (P.), 2,361 ; Dr. J. Davies (M.), 2,281 ; Mr. E. Gates (M.), 2,124. At each of the previous elections two Progressives were returned.

## SOUTHWARK (BERMONDSEY) (15,618).

Dr. A. SALTER (P.) ...	4,197	Mr. J. F. Vesey FitzGerald (M.R.) ...	3,474
*Mr. A. A. ALLEN (P.) ...	4,195	Mr. J. K. Foster (M.R.) ...	3,389
No change. Majority, 723.			

In 1904 the numbers were :—Dr. G. J. Cooper (P.), 3,221 ; Mr. A. A. Allen (P.), 3,215 ; Mr. T. H. Flood (M.), 2,153 ; Mr. F. R. Anderton (M.), 2,085. At each of the previous elections two Progressives were returned.

## SOUTHWARK (ROTHERHITHE) (13,199).

*Mr. A. POMEROY (P.) ...	3,693	Mr. F. Fremantle (M.R.) ...	3,365
*Mr. H. J. GLANVILLE (P.)...	3,663	Mr. F. E. Eddis (M.R.) ...	3,259
No change. Majority, 328.			

In 1904 the numbers were :—Mr. A. Pomeroy (P.), 3,108 ; Mr. H. J. Glanville (P.), 3,029 ; Mr. J. W. Oake (M.), 1,530 ; Mr. W. W. Tyler (M.), 1,418 ; the Rev. W. F. Brown (L.), 1,160. In 1901 and 1898 the division returned two Progressives, in 1895 two Moderates, and in 1892 and 1889 two Progressives.

## SOUTHWARK (WEST) (10,726).

*Mr. T. HUNTER (P.) ...	2,998	Mr. J. T. Scriven (M.R.) ...	2,746
Mr. A. WILSON (P.) ...	2,953	Mr. F. Gillett (M.R.) ...	2,649
No change. Majority, 252.			

In 1904 the numbers were :—Mr. T. Hunter (P.), 2,285 ; Mr. E. Bayley (P.), 2,283 ; Mr. J. T. Scriven (M.), 1,550 ; Mr. E. M. Judge (M.), 1,547. In each of the previous elections the division returned two Progressives, except in 1892, when one Labour and one Progressive were chosen.

## STRAND (10,475).

*LIEUT.-COL. PROBYN (M.R.)	3,580	Mr. S. H. Lamb (P.) ...	903
*LORD ELCHO (M.R.)...	3,558	Mr. W. H. Howell (P.) ...	895
No change. Majority, 2,677.			

In 1904 the figures were :—Lieutenant-Colonel Probyn (M.), 2,403 ; Lord Elcho (M.R.), 2,312 ; the Rev. A. W. Oxford (P.), 1,220 ; Mr. J. S. Hyder (P.), 1,098. At each of the previous elections the division returned two Moderates.

## TOWER HAMLETS (BOW AND BROMLEY) (14,745).

Mr. W. S. M. KNIGHT (M.R.)	3,285	Mr. A. A. Watts (S.D.)	...	786	
Mr. H. V. ROWE (M.R.)	...	3,212	Mr. J. Stokes (S.D.)	...	783
*Mr. W. W. Bruce (P.)	...	3,019	Mr. J. S. Bird (L.)	...	159
*Mr. B. Cooper (P.)	...	3,019			
Two M.R. gains.		Majority, 266.			

In 1901 the numbers were :—Mr. W. W. Bruce (P.), 3,420 ; Mr. B. Cooper (P.), 3,388 ; Mr. H. C. Batchelor (M.), 1,600 ; Captain B. Levett (M.), 1,596. In each of the previous elections the division returned two Progressives, except in the first, when the representation was divided.

## TOWER HAMLETS (LIMEHOUSE) (8,022).

Mr. CYRIL JACKSON (M.R.)...	2,111	*Mr. A. L. Leon (P.)...	1,957
Mr. J. LORT-WILLIAMS (M.R.)	2,026	Mr. T. L. Knight (P.) ...	1,935
Two M.R. gains. Majority, 181.			

In 1901 the numbers were :—Mr. A. B. Bawn (P.), 2,461 ; Mr. A. L. Leon (P.), 2,381 ; Sir C. Elliott (M.), 1,517 ; Mr. E. Gray (M.), 1,396. At each of the previous elections two Progressives were returned.

## TOWER HAMLETS (MILE END) (6,839).

Mr. R. H. MONTGOMERY	Mr. R. Harcourt (P.)...	1,988
(M.R.) ... 2,023	Rev. T. Warren (P.) ...	1,925
Mr. E. H. COOMBE (M.R.)...	2,011	

Two M.R. gains. Majority, 35.

In 1904 the numbers were :—Mr. G. J. Warren (P.), 2,125 ; Mr. B. S. Straus (P.), 2,121 ; Mr. A. O. Goodrich (M.), 1,559 ; Professor W. R. Smith (M.), 1,368 ; Mr. W. Baxter (L.), 36. At each of the previous elections two Progressives were returned, except in 1895, when two Moderates were elected.

## TOWER HAMLETS (POPLAR) (13,263).

*Mr. W. CROOKS, M.P. (P.)...	3,504	Dr. T. H. Clarke (M.R.) ...	2,778
*Sir J. McDougall (P.) ...	3,476	Colonel A. Maude (M.R.) ...	2,579

No change. Majority, 725.

In 1901 the numbers were :—Mr. Crooks, M.P. (P.), 3,536 ; Sir J. McDougall (P.), 3,169 ; Dr. T. H. Clarke (M.), 1,891. At each of the previous elections the division returned two Progressives, except at the first, when the representation was divided.

## TOWER HAMLETS (ST. GEORGE'S) (4,751).

*Mr. H. GOSLING (P.) ...	1,183	Rev. T. King (R.C.) ...	952
Mr. P. C. SIMMONS (M.R.) ...	1,104	Dr. W. R. Smith (M.R.) ...	881
*Mr. J. Smith (P.) ...	1,035	Mr. J. W. Lynch (R.C.) ...	632

One M.R. gain. Majority, 69.

In 1904 the numbers were :—Mr. H. Gosling (P.), 1,350 ; Mr. J. Smith (P.), 1,263 ; Mr. G. Foster (M.), 1,095 ; Mr. H. H. Wells (M.), 1,045. In 1901 the representation was divided, in 1898 two Progressives were returned, in 1895 two Moderates, in 1892 a Progressive and a Labour Progressive, and in 1889 two Progressives.

## TOWER HAMLETS (STEPNEY) (6,584).

Mr. A. O. GOODRICH (M.R.)	2,366	Mr. C. S. Stettaner (P.) ...	1,485
Mr. F. LEVERTON HARRIS		Mr. C. Watson (P.)...	1,386
(M.R.)... ..	2,292		

One M.R. gain. Majority, 881.

In 1904 the numbers were :—Mr. W. C. Steadman (P.), 2,004 ; Lord Malmesbury (M.), 1,960 ; Mr. T. M. Kirkwood (M.), 1,942 ; Mr. Harold Spender (P.), 1,871. In 1901 the representation was divided, in 1898 and 1895 two Progressives were elected, in 1892 a Labour Progressive and a Progressive, and in 1889 a Moderate and a Progressive.

## TOWER HAMLETS (WHITECHAPEL) (5,630).

*Mr. W. C. JOHNSON (P.) ...	1,756	Mr. C. Wertheimer (M.R.)	980
*Mr. H. H. GORDON (L.) ...	1,627	Mr. Elkin (L.P.) ...	773
Mr. E. Hodsoll (M.R.) ...	1,211		

No change. Majority, 545.

In 1904 the numbers were :—Mr. H. H. Gordon (L.), 1,616 ; Mr. W. C. Johnson (P.), 1,326 ; Mr. G. L. Bruce (P.), 1,163 ; the Rev. E. C. Carter (M.), 910 ; Colonel G. B. B. Hobart (M.), 710. In each of the previous elections two Progressives were returned, except in 1895, when a Progressive and a Moderate were chosen.

## WANDSWORTH (43,269).

\*SIR W. J. LANCASTER (M.R.) 15,700    Mr. F. Kellaway (P.) ... 9,628

\*Mr. W. HUNT (M.R.)... ... 14,535

No change. Majority, 6,072.

In 1904 the numbers were :—Mr. W. J. Lancaster (M.), 8,526 ; Mr. W. Hunt (M.), 8,342 ; Mr. R. Tweedie-Smith (P.), 6,782 ; Mr. E. Pascoe-Williams (P.), 6,661. At the 1901 election the representation was divided ; in 1898 two Moderates were returned, but at a by-election in 1899 a Progressive was elected in place of one of these ; in 1895 two Moderates were elected ; and in 1892 and 1889 a Moderate and a Progressive.

## WESTMINSTER (10,664).

HON. W. R. PEEL (M.R.) ... 3,419    Mr. W. B. Campbell (P.)... 1,299

\*Mr. C. Y. STURGE (M.R.) ... 3,392    Mr. E. Herrin (P.) ... 1,298

No change. Majority, 2,120.

In 1904 the numbers were :—Mr. R. W. Granville-Smith (M.), 2,006 ; Mr. C. Y. Sturge (M.), 1,955 ; Mr. C. L. Haywood (P.), 1,192 ; Mr. C. Duncan (L.), 1,169. At the 1901 and 1898 elections two Moderates were returned.

## WOOLWICH (22,830).

Mr. W. J. SQUIRES (M.R.) ... 8,904    \*Rev. L. J. K. Jones (P. & L.) 7,880

Mr. E. A. H. JAY (M.R.) ... 8,677    Mr. G. Lansbury (P. & L.) 7,611

Two M.R. gains. Majority, 1,024.

In 1904 the numbers were :—Rev. L. J. Jones (P.), 6,982 ; Mr. F. Chambers (P.), 6,869 ; Mr. E. A. H. Jay (M.), 4,437 ; Mr. J. M. Dumphreys (M.), 4,097. At each of the previous elections the division returned two Moderates, except in 1892, when a Moderate and an Independent were elected.

## A COMPARISON OF ELECTIONS.

The following is an analysis of the figures at this and previous elections -

—	Pro.	M.R.	Indpt.	Pro. vote.	M.R. vote.	Majority.
1895 ...	59	59	—	126,570	141,502	M.R. 14,932
1898 ...	70	47	1	151,027	148,435	P. 2,592
1901 ...	87	31	—	153,152	114,392	P. 38,759
1904 ...	83	34	1	173,660	143,863	P. 28,799
1907 ...	38	79	1	195,558	210,816	M.R. 45,288

In the figures for 1907 three Labour members are reckoned as Progressives in the number of Progressives returned. In the total votes Labour votes and Socialist votes are reckoned as Progressive votes ; votes for Independent and Roman Catholic candidates are not included in either the Progressive or Moderate vote.



**March 4, 1907.**

## THE NEW COUNCIL.

The following is a complete list of the elected members of the new Council, with their constituencies. An asterisk denotes a member of the outgoing Council :—

George Alexander, M.R., St. Pancras (S.).

\*A. A. Allen, M.P., P., Bermondsey.  
C.A.M. Barlow, M.R., Islington (E.).

\*Sir R. M. Beachcroft, M.R.,  
Paddington (S.).

\*Dr. R. M. Beaton, P., St. Pancras  
(N.).

A. Shirley Benn, M.R., Battersea.

I. H. Benn, M.R., Greenwich.

\*Sir J. W. Benn, M.P., P., Ken-  
nington.

Lord H. Bentinck, M.R., Maryle-  
bone (W.).

G. Billings, M.R., Hackney (Central).

J. Boyton, M.R., Marylebone (E.).

\*J. Brandon, M.R., Hammersmith.

\*R. Bray, P., Camberwell (N.).

\*F. Briant, P., Lambeth (N.).

F. Cassel, M.R., St. Pancras (W.).

W. A. Casson, P., Hackney (S.).

T. Chapman, P., Hackney (S.).

\*Lord Cheylesmore, M.R., St.  
George's, Hanover-square.

A. W. Claremont, P., St. Pancras  
(E.).

H. J. Clarke, M.R., Islington (W.).

\*C. Cobb, M.R., Fulham.

N. L. Cohen, M.R., City.

\*E. Collins, M.R., Hammersmith.

Sir C. Kinloch-Cooke, M.R., Clap-  
ham.

\*Sir E. Cornwall, M.P., P., Bethnal-  
green (N.E.).

E. H. Coombe, M.R., Mile-end.

\*W. Crooks, M.P., P., Poplar.

Dr. J. Davies, M.R., Haggerston.

\*W. Davies, P., Battersea.

D. Davis, M.R., Kensington (N.).

\*J. A. Daws, P., Walworth.

Rev. E. Demy, P., Kennington.

\*G. Dew, P., Islington (S.).

T. W. Domoney, M.R., Clapham.

F. L. Dove, M.R., Islington (N.).

W. L. Downton, M.R., Peckham.

Lord Duncannon, M.R., Marylebone  
(E.).

E. G. Easton, M.R., Fulham.

\*Lord Elcho, M.R., Strand.

C. C. Fisher, M.R., Norwood.

\*Dr. E. B. Forman, M.R., Kensing-  
ton (S.).

\*T. Gautrey, P., Peckham.

\*J. D. Gilbert, P., Newington (W.).

\*H. J. Glanville, P., Rotherhithe.

T. C. E. Goff, M.R., Chelsea.

\*F. Goldsmith, M.R., St. Pancras  
(S.).

H. C. Gooch, M.R., Dulwich.

\*A. O. Goodrich, M.R., Stepney.

\*H. H. Gordon, I., Whitechapel.

\*H. Gosling, P., St. George's,  
Tower Hamlets.

R. Greene, M.R., Hackney (N.).

\*H. J. Greenwood, M.R., St.  
George's, Hanover-square.

E. Gray, M.R., Hoxton.

\*Hon. R. Guinness, M.R., Hagger-  
ston.

Hon. W. Guinness, M.R., Paddin-  
gton (N.).

F. Hall, M.R., Dulwich.

Alderman F. S. Hanson, M.R.,  
City.

P. A. Harris, P., Bethnal-green  
(S.W.).

F. L. Harris, M.R., Stepney.

\*H. P. Harris, M.R., Paddington  
(S.).

Rev. F. Hastings, P., St. Pancras  
(E.).

W. Haydon, M.R., Lambeth.

Rev. Stewart Headlam, P., Bethnal-  
green (S.W.).

\*Captain Hon. F. Hemphill, P.,  
Finsbury (Central).

S. J. G. Hoare, M.R., Lambeth.

E. Howes, M.R., Finsbury (E.).

\*W. Hunt, M.R., Wandsworth.

J. H. Hunter, M.R., Paddington,  
(N.).

\*T. Hunter, P., Southwark, W.

C. Jackson, M.R., Limehouse.

E. A. H. Jay, M.R., Woolwich.

\*C. Jesson, P., Walworth.

\*W. C. Johnson, P., Whitechapel.

Hon. G. Johnstone, M.R., Hagger-  
ston.

Lord Kerry, M.R., Marylebone  
(W.).

W. H. Key, M.R., Hackney, (N.).

- W. S. M. Knight, M.R., Bow and Bromley.  
 \*Sir W. J. Lancaster, M.R., Wandsworth.  
 Lord Lewisham, M.R., Lewisham.  
 Hon. H. Lygon, M.R., Holborn.  
 \*Sir J. M'Dougall, P., Poplar.  
 R. H. Montgomery, M.R., Mile-end  
 F. St. J. Morrow, M.R., Norwood.  
 C. K. Murchison, M.R., Islington (N.).  
 R. C. Norman, M.R., Chelsea.  
 W. H. Pannell, M.R., City.  
 Hon. W. R. Peel, M.R., Westminster.  
 \*R. C. Phillimore, P., Deptford.  
 P. E. Pilditch, M.R., Islington (E.).  
 \*A. Pomeroy, P., Rotherhithe.  
 A. Pownall, M.R., Lewisham.  
 \*Lieutenant-Colonel A. Probyn, M.R., Strand.  
 W. Reynolds, M.R., Hampstead.  
 \*R. A. Robinson, M.R., Kensington (S.).  
 H. V. Rowe, M.R., Bow and Bromley.  
 \*A. B. Russell, P., Finsbury (Central).  
 I. Salmon, M.R., Islington (W.).  
 \*Dr. A. Salter, P., Bermondsey.  
 \*H. S. Sankey, M.R., City.  
 P. C. Simmonds, M.R., St. George's, Tower Hamlets.  
 Major C. L. A. Skimmer, M.R., Kensington (N.).  
 \*E. Smith, P., Bethnal - green (N.E.).  
 F. Smith, L., Lambeth (N.).  
 \*Evan Spicer, P. Newington (W.).  
 W. J. Squires, M.R., Woolwich.  
 W. B. Stewart, M.R., Hackney (Central).  
 \*C. Y. Sturge, M.R., Westminster.  
 \*H. R. Taylor, P., Cumberwell (N.).  
 \*J. T. Taylor, M.R., Hampstead.  
 Lord A. J. Thynne, M.R., Greenwich.  
 P. Vosper, M.R., St. Pancras (W.).  
 \*D. S. Waterlow, M.P., P., St. Pancras (N.).  
 \*Sidney Webb, P., Deptford.  
 Colonel A. C. Welby, M.R., Finsbury (E.).  
 E. E. Wild, M.R., Holborn.  
 \*H. J. Williams, P., Islington (S.).  
 J. L. Williams, M.R., Limehouse.  
 A. Wilson, P., Southwark (W.).



**March 19, 1907.**

## **POSTSCRIPT.**

The verdict of the electors has opened a new chapter in the history of the Council. It will be written hereafter in due time, no doubt; at present only the heading stands, and that is "Change." Whatever conclusions or inferences are drawn from the election, one thing is quite certain, and that is that a large majority of those who take any interest in the matter at all desire a change. Some persons evidently do not believe that there will be any change worth mentioning. The collective and sagacious observer of affairs, commonly called "Mr. Punch," who often conveys much wisdom in a jest, took this view. He played the shrewd cynic, represented the contest as a matter of small interest and less importance, a case of six of one and half a dozen of the other, and virtually told his readers that it did not matter for whom they voted or whether they voted at all. Herein his sagacity failed him. Shrewd cynicism is a cheap and shoddy make of wisdom; it takes the eye of the foolish when it is new, but has no substance in it, and soon wears visibly to rags. We have had too much of it in regard to municipal affairs; it has long been worn out, and happily it did not prevail on this occasion. The importance of the issue was not realized so fully as it might have been, but enough people took it seriously to produce a decisive result. This is, in truth, a matter of far greater interest than appears on the surface, as I will try to explain, if the reader will bear with me.

Socialism—that is, the organized political and economic movement known by that name—is rapidly becoming the leading question in all Western countries at the present epoch, if it has not already taken the lead. It embraces or touches all the other questions generally considered important, such as international relations, war, disarmament, forms of government, religion, taxation, education; it is pretty nearly world-wide, and expanding year by year. Such domestic questions as the House of Lords and Home Rule are mere trifles compared with the march of this movement. Those who do not see that are blind to what is going on about them. Many are beginning to see; they know at least that it is not a thing merely to laugh at; they are afraid of it, but do not understand it. Most even of those who call themselves Socialists do not comprehend what is happening. The prevailing idea, alike among those who fear and those who hope, is that it means something abrupt, if not violent; a perceptible overthrow or collapse of existing arrangements and relations. That was the idea of Marx, and still is the idea of that section of Socialists which follows his teaching, and is probably more numerous than any other; they look to a political

revolution of some kind, not by force, but still a revolution, though they have never explained how it is to come about. Others, clearer-sighted, do not believe in a revolution, but in a consummation by gradual steps. Nearly everybody, however, believes that Socialism is a movement of the people, of the "working classes," or the "proletariate," to use the particularly inappropriate term beloved by Socialists, and that, whether it be the handwriting on the wall presaging the overthrow of Babylon or the initiation of a slow constitutional process, it has behind it the immense potential force of the people. But that is not so—yet. Socialism is not a popular movement; it did not spring from the people, like trade unionism and co-operation, nor has it been carried on by the people. It is a half-intellectual half-emotional movement, which emanated from the *bourgeoisie* or middle classes and has been carried on by them. The leading names, which form landmarks in its development, all belong to that stratum of society. Godwin, whose "Political Justice" laid the foundation of systematic Socialism and contained all the essential ideas since developed, was for some years a Nonconformist minister and was the son of one. Owen, who translated the idea into action, crude and short-lived but real, who gave it its name, and made it familiar, was a manufacturer. Marx, who was the father of political Socialism as we know it, was a *Gelehrter*. These are the most outstanding landmarks, and the others are like unto them. It is curious that this movement, which so loudly proclaims itself anti-*bourgeois*, should derive all its inspiration from *bourgeois* sources. "Labour" has contributed nothing, although the ostensible object of the whole thing is to secure the "rights" of labour. Socialism has, of course, appealed to that class and endeavoured to obtain its support; in recent times it has particularly aimed at utilizing the great strength of the trade unions, with some, but more apparent than real, success. It has gained some more or less convinced adherents among the prominent men, but its hold over the rank and file is very slight. Over the mass of the people it has failed to obtain any direct hold at all, which was only to be expected. Economic theories are about as intelligible and attractive to the mass of the people as higher mathematics. As for the poor, they are the most conservative of all classes.

For these reasons Socialism portends no revolutionary rising of the people, nor even a great organization from within. It has failed to capture them directly and has betaken itself to the political path. It relies on the ballot-box, and appeals not to the man, but to the voter. Some persons may think there is no great difference except that the revolution will be gradual instead of sudden; and that appears to be the opinion of Socialists themselves. They do not doubt the end for a moment; they are certain that their ideas will be realized. But there is an enormous difference between a movement which

has behind it millions of devoted adherents and one which makes way not by the conversion of convinced believers in its truth, but by votes drawn from indifferent hearers by attractive promises of tangible benefit. As soon as it becomes a power, it is by that very fact placed upon trial in the eyes of its supporters, who are free to withdraw their support if the promises are not realized. Socialists believe in their theory by conviction, and probably nothing would shake their faith; if the people were in the same case they would be irresistible, but that is just what they are not. The people have no faith, though they may have hope; they wait for results. The popular success of Socialism in various countries during the last few years means that its promises have been so far accepted as to make it a power, and thereby to place it on trial. It has two spheres of action—the legislative and the administrative; in some countries the former, in others the latter, is the more prominent. In Germany, for instance, the forces of Socialism are mainly concentrated on the Reichstag; in England they have only just begun to exercise any influence in Parliament; their real activity has been brought to bear upon administration, chiefly through local government. In both countries recent elections have illustrated the point I am trying to establish. In both, Socialism has had to re-appeal to the people after a period of prolonged and increasing success at the polls, and in both, to its great disappointment and the surprise of those who do not go below the surface of current events, the instability of a power which rests upon the ballot-box has been demonstrated. So far from sweeping onward in a gathering wave of enthusiasm, Socialism has been shown to be merely on trial, and subject to the cold verdict of an independent electorate.

These considerations lend extreme interest to the London County Council election and the situation produced by its result. It is here in England, the original birthplace of Socialism, that it has been brought to the test of actual experience. The Social Democratic party in the German Reichstag has been sterile, it has produced only negative results; but Socialistic municipal administration in England has produced positive results which can be judged and weighed. London is the great example, and the County Council the chief instrument. I am not concerned to argue the question whether Progressive Councillors are or call themselves Socialists or not; the point is that Socialism has made use of the party, as it has made use, though less fully, of the trade unions. The distinctive features of the Progressive policy have been purely Socialistic. They are not confined to London or to the County Council, but that body has led the way. The fullest exposition of Municipal Socialism is entitled "The London Programme"; and Mr. Stead has truly called the County Council "the nursing mother of Municipal Socialism."

Now, it is that policy which has been on trial and has met with a rebuff. The electors have called for a change, and the important question is what the change is to be; for we may be quite certain of this, that, if the change fails to justify itself, they will go back and give Socialism another and a better chance. The progress of events will be watched all over the world: for the significance of the experimental trial of Socialism in London and its result have been more clearly realized at a distance than at home, and the sound of the recent election has reverberated far and wide. The sequel, therefore, will exercise great influence. If the new administration be successful in retaining public confidence, Socialism will be deeply discredited; for it will have tried and failed, and will have been proved inferior to alternative methods. The more advanced Socialists, no doubt, deny that it has ever had a trial, and despise such a milk-and-watery business as London County Council Socialism. But they are not the judges, and the people who are will assuredly be slow to swallow a large dose of this particular medicine when they see that a small one has done them more harm than good, and that they are better without it. If Fabianism leads to financial embarrassment, Social Democracy would spell bankruptcy. The same reasoning applies to the whole field of legislative action. If Municipal Socialism is discredited, State Socialism will be still less acceptable. We see that plainly enough in the reaction of the London municipal elections on Parliament; the Socialist section there at once lost ground, and its opponents or unwilling friends no longer fear it as they did. In fact, it is in the municipalities, and particularly in the London County Council, that the real battle is being fought. It would be too much to say that the whole future of Socialism depends on the result; but certainly its future will be profoundly influenced by the result.

The new administration can succeed if it has the will. It starts under fair auspices, with a sufficient backing of public favour and no incubus of extravagant expectations; for it has made no impossible promises. It will automatically shed some of the objectionable weaknesses which rendered the Council an object of general dislike—the desire for aggrandisement, the domineering quarrelsome spirit and the vulgar habit of bragging, which it learnt from the greatest boaster known to public life since Cleon the tanner. These things will disappear, and with them the friction between the Council and other bodies, which has been a great public disadvantage. But in dropping the weaknesses of its predecessors the new Council must be careful not to shed their merits, and in particular the merit of work. It cannot be denied that in the past the Moderate side of the Council has had the reputation of being less hardworking, less zealous, and less regular in attendance than the Progressives. If that reputation

is retained, or earned again, it will be fatal to them. The work of the Council entails a great deal of drudgery, and, unless the members of the party now in power are prepared to do the work and put their backs into it, they will suffer by comparison and be found wanting. One of the things which helped to turn opinion so strongly against the Progressives was the large number of them who had recently gone into Parliament and were pre-occupied with other affairs. If the other side indulge in slack attendance without any such excuse, they will certainly lose public confidence.

Of specific problems before them, the greatest is, of course, the financial position of the Council. They have been well advised in resolving to go thoroughly into the matter, and, if they are wise, they will lose no time about it. The public quite understands that the position is inherited, and that an immediate extrication from embarrassments is impossible; it expects no wonders, but it does expect to be taken into the Council's confidence and to have the state of the case put fairly before it. If no economies are possible, it will be wise to say so at once; a straightforward open policy will pay best. But there is certainly one point in which economy can be exercised, and that is in dropping the expenditure devoted to promoting Socialistic legislation in Parliament and to vexatiously opposing all other bodies, public or private, that propose to do anything which might hypothetically be done by the London County Council. That is what the Council has been doing steadily for years, as a matter of principle, without any regard to cost, chance of success, or the public welfare. Enormous sums have in this way been thrown into the sea, that is into the pockets of lawyers, technical experts, and witnesses, without any result except to delay useful or necessary works. A chapter might be written on this head, at least as telling as anything that has gone before; for in nothing done by the Progressive party has the subordination of public interest to Socialistic theory and to the aggrandisement of the Council been more plainly shown. Here we touch what is, of course, the most difficult and the most widely important question before the new Council—its attitude towards Municipal Socialism; and in regard to this it appears to me that there is some risk that a mistake may be made.

Municipal trading or enterprise is not necessarily Socialistic. It existed long before Socialism was thought of, and to-day there is many a town in Germany where it is more highly developed than in London without a single Socialist on the town council, which may be entirely composed of anti-Socialists and yet deliberately undertake all kinds of municipal enterprises. The difference is this—that in such cases municipal action is not adopted as a matter of principle, but because there are good reasons for believing that it will be to the public ad-

vantage, whereas Socialists assume that municipal action must always and in all cases be to the public advantage and preferable to private action, because it is a step towards that complete collectivism at which they aim. Hostility to private enterprise is the keynote of their policy. It follows that, when they have succeeded in installing some municipal enterprise, they have so far attained their object, and do not feel strongly the necessity of making it successful in fact as well as in theory. It is enough to say that it is successful when election time comes round. Hence carelessness, extravagance, blunders, and then shifty expedients to cover them up. But, if the other side make opposition to municipal, and the support of private, enterprise a matter of principle, they will fall into the same mistake. Sometimes private enterprise is better, but it must not be assumed to be so. Theoretical Socialism and Individualism are both fallacious, for the bed-rock fact is that man is both individual and social, and unfitted by nature to have either everything or nothing in common with his fellows. The only rule to go by is to judge each case, without prejudice, on its merits, so far as they can be ascertained. And to that end it is desirable that the existing enterprises of the Council should be thoroughly overhauled and their true position and prospects ascertained, so far as it is possible. If they are good, let them stand; if not, let them cease. The public will acquiesce, for reason shown. As for the allegation that the election was fought and won in the interest of monopolies and trusts, it would be an insult to the Council to notice it, as it would be an insult to the old Council to praise its clean administration. Integrity is not so rare that we need thank God for an honest man. Mr. Burns seems to think it wonderful that he and his friends should have clean hands; I consider it elementary, but then I am not a Socialist.


The guiding rule, which includes all the rest, is to keep steadily in view the interests of the whole community and never subordinate them to party, prejudice, theory, or class. If the new Council does that, it will retain the merits, and avoid the defects, of the old one, and will show the world a better way.

---

---

NOTE.—On page 20 the sentence in brackets beginning “ This probably means . . . ” was written under a misapprehension to which the writer’s attention has since been called, and he wishes to withdraw it. He understands that the words “ those of the borough councils ” mean “ those functions of the borough councils.” The ambiguity is due to the clumsy wording of the manifesto.

---

 The date of publication in *The Times* is shown at the head of each article.





01226 8230

LIBRARY

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA  
AT  
LOS ANGELES  
LIBRARY



3 1158 01226 8230

UC SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY



**AA** 000 994 508 0

